Popular Experience and Cultural Representation of the Great War, 1914-1918

Popular Experience and Cultural Representation of the Great War, 1914-1918

Edited by

Ruth Larsen and Ian Whitehead

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Popular Experience and Cultural Representation of the Great War, 1914-1918

Edited by Ruth Larsen and Ian Whitehead

This book first published 2017

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2017 by Ruth Larsen, Ian Whitehead and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9590-3
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9590-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction 1

Chapter One 5
"Mechanical Human Beasts": The Experience of Killing
Phillip Booth, Kieran Hull, Daniel Turner and Konrad Wells-Corp

Chapter Two 15
Pals in Arms: Homosociability, Hegemonic Masculinity and the Great War
Jenny Cook, Ashton Cunningham, Leanne Jones and Matthew Wood

Chapter Three 25
Beyond *War Horse*: Animals and Total War
Vicki Fordham, Sophie Birch, Calvin Smith and Ryan Khaira

Chapter Four 35
"Tickling Men to War": The White Feather Campaign
Victoria Hammonds, Tracey Handley, James Malley and Rebecca Sturgess

Chapter Five 45
Life in Ruhleben Camp: Edwardian Britain in Microcosm
Christopher Batten, Jason Pickering, Ellie Walsh and Nathan Willcox

Chapter Six 57
Teddies, Toy Soldiers and the Militarisation of Playtime
Lydia Mcgraw, Helen Wright and Jade Kelly-Smith

Chapter Seven 63
Beyond Franz Ferdinand and Belgium: Britain's Real War Aims
Elliot Chapman, Charlie Bradley, Leigh-Ann Harris and Bradley Warren

Chapter Eight 73
Trouble in Paradise: The West Indies at War
Jorden Crawford, Alexandra Kempson, Fern Pithers and Lewis Wale

Chapter Nine 81
Australia: A Nation Made in War? Defiance, Disappointment
and Determination
Adam Al-Safi, Shelby Squire and Sophie Philips

Chapter Ten 91
Requiem: Foulds, Beaverbrook and a "British" Festival of Remembrance
Anthony Butterworth, Thomas Debaere, Laura Jackson and Rickesh Patel

Chapter Eleven 101
"Biggles Sorts it Out!" Captain W.E. Johns and the Reinvention
of the Heroic Ideal for British Boys
Beth Harris, Dan Dunning, David Pugh and Laura Winspeare

Chapter Twelve 109
Crisis of Faith? C.S. Lewis, Religion and the First World War
Nichola Tonks and Katherine Sykes

Selected Bibliography 119

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The contributors would like to acknowledge the assistance supplied by staff at the following: The British Library; The National Fairground Archive, University of Sheffield; The Liddle Collection, Brotherton Library, University of Leeds; Sudbury Hall and the National Museum of Childhood; University of Birmingham Library; University of Derby Library; and the London Transport Museum.

INTRODUCTION

The chapters in this volume were originally delivered as papers at the University of Derby's seventh annual Public History Conference, which in 2014 marked the hundredth anniversary of the outbreak of the First World War.

Each year, the Public History Conference is planned, organised and delivered by second year undergraduate History students. The Conference enables students to engage in a significant piece of collaborative research and writing. As the Conference is open to the public, it provides an exciting opportunity for students to convey their ideas to a wider audience and so promote public debate about the past and how it informs the present. Thus, at a time when Britain was reflecting on the momentous events of 1914, the Conference was able to promote discussion about how the British people responded to the challenge of the War, as well as exploring the extent to which perspectives on the conflict have evolved over the subsequent century.

A number of the chapters examine the role of prevailing ideas about gender in determining social expectations of how men and women responded to the national cause. Chapter One discusses how men coped with the harsh reality of combat and killing on the Western Front, whilst Chapter Two considers the ways in which masculine gender ideals and male social relationships influenced men's willingness to take up arms and subsequently sustain the fight. The emergence of new technology was one of the factors which shaped the soldiers' experience of the battlefield. However, as Chapter Three highlights, despite the mechanisation of modern warfare, animals continued to be an important resource. Horses are the best known and perhaps the most romanticised of the animal participants in battle, but the chapter highlights the key part played by other creatures. It also draws attention to the role played by animals on the Home Front.

The Home Front has generally been seen as providing a vehicle for advancing progressive ideas about the role of women in society. However, as Chapter Four highlights, the controversial White Feather Campaign

drew on traditional ideas of gender roles in war and ultimately became an embarrassment to those championing the female cause. The White Feather Campaign was a reflection of the patriotic feeling that overtook the British nation in 1914. A strong sense of British identity and a faith in the superiority of British values, customs and institutions underpinned the collective war effort. Chapter Five looks at how British prisoners in the Ruhleben internment camp were able to create a version of their homeland, through the organisational structures that governed their lives in captivity and the sports and recreations that they organised, in order to relieve their boredom. On the Home Front, recreation also provided a means for reinforcing patriotism and pride in British institutions. Chapter Six highlights how both before and during the War, children's toys, games and organisations evolved to ensure that boys and girls identified with their nation and were prepared for the roles that, as adults, they might be called upon to undertake in war.

In 1914, British propaganda emphasised the extent to which Britain's involvement in the War was driven by defending 'poor little Belgium'. Later in the War, Lloyd George's declaration of British War Aims also reinforced the collective belief that Britain was fighting in the cause of liberty and democracy against the tyranny of German militarism and expansionism. Such justifications provide a version of why Britain fought that sits comfortably with us today. However, as Chapter Seven reminds us, Britain was at the apex of the World's greatest empire. For Britain, the War was one which had to be fought, in order to preserve and potentially extend that imperial domain. It was also a conflict in which Britain's colonies made vital contributions to the war effort through the supply of manpower, goods and finance. Chapter Eight examines the contribution of the West Indies to the war effort, highlighting the extent to which racial prejudice exposed the limitations of the shared British identity that supposedly united the Empire. As a consequence, the War played a significant part in promoting West Indian nationalism and undermining faith in the competency of British rule. Similar themes are explored in Chapter Nine, which considers the role that the War played in fashioning and promoting a distinct sense of Australian identity.

Commemoration of the First World War, and in particular the ANZAC Myth, continues to be a significant factor in reinforcing a contemporary sense of Australian identity. Chapter Ten highlights how different political and cultural agendas have shaped the way in which Britain has remembered the War, through an examination of changing attitudes to the

performance of John Foulds' *A World Requiem*. Perhaps even more so than music, literature has played a significant part in shaping how we remember the War, most famously through the works of the 'soldier poets'. The latter, particularly writers such as Owen and Sassoon, helped to construct a collective memory of the War that stressed its futility. By contrast, an author who sought to emphasise the extent to which the War had offered the opportunity for the development and display of positive British attributes was W.E. Johns. Chapter Eleven charts how Johns, through the exploits of his fictional creation, Captain James Bigglesworth (Biggles), provided a role-model of British heroism that inspired and entertained his readers for decades.

Throughout the book, the chapters highlight the pitfalls of generalising about how Britons reacted to the War, how they coped with its challenges and how they came to rationalise it in its aftermath. In the final chapter, there is an examination of the means by which one individual, C.S. Lewis, came to terms with his war experiences, reflecting on how these feelings influenced his writing and personal beliefs.

As we look back on the Great War from the standpoint of the centenary commemorations, we will continue to debate what the War meant to its participants and how it has shaped us since. Given the purpose of the Public History Conference, from which this volume arose, the authors hope that they have made a valuable contribution to that discussion.

—Ruth Larsen and Ian Whitehead

CHAPTER ONE

"MECHANICAL HUMAN BEASTS": THE EXPERIENCE OF KILLING

PHILLIP BOOTH, KIERAN HULL, DANIEL TURNER AND KONRAD WELLS-CORP

This chapter explores how soldiers experienced killing during the Great War. It proceeds to examine the pleasure that soldiers gained from fighting and killing, highlighting the relationship between the experience of killing and the machine mentality. It considers the background factors, which affected how soldiers could respond to the act of killing, and also looks at case studies of how individual soldiers reacted to their own killing exploits. The chapter demonstrates that many soldiers in fact enjoyed the experience of killing their enemies, and that this conclusion can help add significantly to our knowledge of the Great War and of the nature of warfare in general.

Joanna Bourke rightly observed in her 1999 book *An Intimate History of Killing* that 'the characteristic act of men at war is not dying, it is killing'.[1] Yet when it comes to conventional portrayals of the Great War, this is a truth which is all too often avoided. Instead, most give the impression that soldiers simply went to war in order to be miserable in the trenches or, if they were not so lucky, to end up with their name inscribed on some well-tended war grave or neglected village cenotaph.[2] This is perhaps a more palatable tale than one filled with murderous Tommies. Yet, History should be about an unblinking pursuit of truth, rather than a timid quest for the cosiest narrative. When the act of killing is given its due attention, we are permitted to get just a little closer to the truth of the Great War, and of those who fought and killed in it.

---

[1] Bourke, J., *An Intimate History of Killing: face-to-face killing in twentieth-century warfare* (London: Granta, 1999), p. 1.
[2] Bourke, *An Intimate History of Killing*, p. 2.

Initially, it is important to state that soldiers experienced the act of killing through a wide variety of emotions ranging from pleasure, to guilt, to moral outrage. However, perhaps pleasure is the most interesting of these, if only because it is the response that many may find most discomfiting, and which may most challenge prevailing representations of the Great War soldier. Indeed, evidence of soldiers enjoying killing is not difficult to find. Such evidence should hardly surprise us, when we realise that soldiers were trained and instructed to enjoy the act of killing, and if they did not then they could not properly be called members of the infantry. [3] For example, the 1918 Handbook for the 42nd East Lancashire Division exhorted officers to "be bloodthirsty, and never cease to think how you can best kill the enemy or help your men to do so".[4]

In fact, many men required no such instruction to enjoy the experience of fighting. As Martin van Creveld has stated:

> War ... far from being merely a means, has very often been considered an end – a highly attractive activity for which no other can provide an adequate substitute ... However unpalatable the fact, the real reason why we have wars is that men like fighting.[5]

Such considerations led some men to feel relief upon the outbreak of war in 1914. For example, Rupert Brooke was thankful to God because He had "matched us with His hour, and caught our youth, and wakened us from sleeping" and had saved him from "a world grown old and cold and weary".[6] A love of war is also apparent in the testimony of a German sailor at the Battle of Jutland, as described by Lawrence Freedman. The sailor in question reported being impatient for the guns of war to sound, as he relished the very thought of battle. He marvelled at the sight of the German ships, which he described as being like elephants charging forward.[7] As the grandiose drama of battle unfolded, he was not simply afraid. Rather, he experienced a strange mixture of fear, joy, curiosity, apathy and a sheer love of war.[8] Yet we should remember that such

---

[3] Bourke, *An Intimate History of Killing*, pp. 1-2, 3, 369.
[4] 'Maxims for the Leader', *42nd East Lancashire Division, Handbook* (Aldershot, 1918), p. 8, cited in Bourke, *An Intimate History of Killing*, p. 2.
[5] M.V. Creveld cited in Ferguson, N., *The Pity of War* (London: Penguin, 1999), p. 360.
[6] R. Brooke cited in Wilson, T., *The Myriad Faces of War: Britain and the Great War, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Polity, 1986) pp. 10-11.
[7] Freedman, L. (ed.), *War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 20.
[8] Freedman, *War*, p. 22.

attitudes to war did not only result from the anticipated (or actualised) joys that fighting could bring. They were also possible because, at this point, people were still relatively unaware of the horrors that modern, industrialised warfare could bring, as well as just how worthless the products of costly victory could be.[9]

In order to understand how soldiers experienced fighting and killing, it is important to consider the relationship between war and the machine mentality. As Daniel Pick has argued, there is a certain mechanical element in the way that human beings kill one another. The human psyche is reduced to a machine-like state, while the machines of war are imbued with excessive destructive power, even a kind of sexual energy. Soldiers ultimately came not only to see themselves as machines, but also their opponents. This enabled the rationalisation of killing as the mere termination of an opposing 'machine', rather than the destruction of a human life.[10]

However, due to the amoral connotations of the machine mentality, it can also be utilised as an effective image in propaganda material. Such was the case during the Great War, when the Allies related stories of German atrocities to the machine-like mentality, which the German nation had purportedly developed during the course of the nineteenth century. The supposed 'high culture' of Germany had finally been laid bare as a nightmarish 'monstrosity' within Western civilisation.[11] On the other hand, German propagandists portrayed England as having something like a dual personality. There was the 'Anglo-Saxon' part, which reflected honesty, outspokenness and a love of liberty, yet there was also a 'Norman-French' part, which displayed taciturnity, ruthlessness, and enterprise in the pursuit of conquest. When viewed in such terms, the War could easily be rationalised as the inevitable unleashing of formerly hidden instincts and passions.[12]

We must also not forget the background factors that affected how soldiers experienced killing. For example, there were distinct differences between the traits of those soldiers who savoured killing, and those who were horrified by it. One belief is that soldiers from urban areas lacked the

[9] Wilson, *The Myriad Faces of War*, p. 10.
[10] Pick, D., *War machine: the rationalisation of slaughter in the modern age* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1993), p. 21.
[11] Pick, *War machine*, p. 155.
[12] Pick, *War machine*, p. 151.

resolution and toughness of their rural counterparts, who were more traditional recruits to the armed forces.[13] It is also thought that soldiers from rural areas were more used to handling weaponry, as opposed to urban soldiers who were often younger and thus had little, if any, experience with firearms. These factors ultimately lead officers to view urban youths as being inherently weak, which then meant that they felt the need to emphasise an offensive mentality in order to compensate for the supposed weakness. The fact that they were surrounded by soldiers who did not balk at the act of killing also placed added pressure on urban recruits to face the act of killing with, at the very least, equanimity.[14]

Those soldiers who did not naturally enjoy the experience of killing were not simply left alone to deal with their feelings as best they could. Rather, before being sent to the front, they were specifically trained in how to use weaponry, in the course of which the minutiae of killing was often described to them. For example, a War Office training pamphlet on the use of bayonets stated that:

> If possible the point of the bayonet should be directed against the opponent's throat, especially in corps-d-corps fighting, as the point will enter easily and make a final fatal wound on penetrating a few inches and, being near the eyes, makes an opposite 'funk'. Other vulnerable exposed parts are the face, chest, lower abdomen and thighs, and the region of the kidneys when the back is turned. Four to six inches penetration is sufficient to incapacitate and allow for quick withdrawal, whereas if the bayonet is driven home too far it is often impossible to withdraw. In such cases a round should be fired to break up the obstruction.[15]

More and more training ultimately became necessary during the course of the war as the pace of weapon development accelerated. Intense struggles took place to try and connect men with their weaponry, which also coincided with a shift in the image of the battlefield. The latter changed from being seen as primarily psychological, to become more technological in nature.[16] However, these processes also served to reduce the responsibility

---

[13] Jones, E., 'The psychology of killing: The combat experience of British Soldiers during the First World War', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 41.2 (2006), p. 231.
[14] Jones, 'The psychology of killing', p. 232.
[15] Cited in Bridger, G., *The Great War handbook* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Family History, 2009), p. 79.
[16] Travers, T., *The killing ground: the British Army, the Western Front and the emergence of modern war, 1900-1918* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2003), p. 77.

of individual agents for the act of killing, which could make some feel much less anxious about the act. For example, teamwork was required to operate any form of artillery, which helped to spread the responsibility for killing beyond any single soldier.[17]

One mechanism which infantrymen employed to cope with the trauma of killing was to fire their rifles only in the general direction of the enemy, with only relatively few men, such as snipers, actually taking deliberate aim at a lone individual and killing him. The development of machine guns, some of which could kill at a range of up to a thousand yards, also helped to make the killing experience more indirect.[18] However, even though killing became less intimate, soldiers could still not escape the knowledge and feelings which came with the act. Therefore, some men felt they needed a motive for killing in order to make the experience more palatable. For example, Frank Brent, an NCO in the Australian Imperial Force, remarked that: "there was the feeling of exultation that once again you were going to be able to extract retribution from the fellows that had killed your mates".[19] Indeed, this quote starkly illustrates one of the most important reasons why soldiers carried on fighting during the Great War: in order to have the opportunity to avenge the deaths of former comrades.

In order to explore the experience of killing in more detail, it is necessary to examine case studies of individual soldiers, to see how they personally responded to the act. One such example, which is well-documented in the historiography, is the story of Julian Grenfell. Grenfell was born in 1888 into a landowning family with a long tradition of military service. He then went on to be educated at Eton and Balliol College, before joining the First Royal Dragoons as a cavalry officer in 1910. Over the next four years, he saw action in India and South Africa, before being posted to France upon the outbreak of the Great War.[20] Raymond Asquith knew Grenfell personally, and wrote of his character:

---

[17] Jones, 'The psychology of killing', p. 237.
[18] Bridger, *The Great War handbook*, p. 112.
[19] Frank Brent cited in Siebert, D. (dir.) *I Was There: The Great War Interviews* (BBC Two, First Broadcast: 14 March 2014).
[20] Bergonzi, B., *Heroes' twilight: a study of the literature of the Great War* Third edition (Manchester: Carcanet, 1996), p. 40; Hynes, S., *The soldier's tale: bearing witness to modern war* (London: Pimlico, 1998), p. 34; Walter, G. (ed.), *The Penguin book of First World War poetry* (London: Penguin, 2006), p. 341.

> Perfectly made and perpetually fit he flung himself upon life in a surge of restless and unconquerable energy. Riding, or rowing, or boxing, or running with his greyhounds, or hunting the Boches in Flanders, he 'tired the sun with action' as others have with talk.[21]

Whilst he served in France, Grenfell also stated his own views on war when he declared: "I *adore* war. It is like a big picnic without the objectlessness of a picnic. I've never been so well or so happy".[22] These statements help to put into better context Grenfell's killing exploits, and the way in which he understood those exploits. In one such case in October 1914, Grenfell crawled out into no man's land; as he recorded in his diary, he then spotted a German "laughing and talking. I saw his teeth glisten against my foresight, and I pulled the trigger very steady. He just gave a grunt and crumpled up".[23] The following day Grenfell crawled out again and spotted a lone German "coming along upright carelessly, making a great noise. I let him get within 25 yards and then shot him through the heart. He never made a sound".[24] Neither incident seems to have served any obvious strategic purpose. The only real point to both seems to have been to sate Grenfell's bloodlust, since, for him, war was something akin to hunting or sport.[25] However, Grenfell's war adventure was ultimately cut short on 27 May 1915, when he died of his wounds in France. His death was perhaps symbolic of a wider decline in the aristocratic, chivalric view of war that he stood for, a view which became increasingly difficult to maintain as the war ground on, and even more so after the Battle of the Somme.[26]

Comparing the stories of two of the most notable writers of war, Ernst Junger and Siegfried Sassoon, can also help to shed more light on how soldiers experienced the act of killing. Firstly, it is clear that the motives which Junger and Sassoon both had for fighting and killing their enemies were vastly different. Junger viewed the prospect of killing enemy soldiers through a martial and sportsman-like lens, such as when he stated in his memoirs that: "Throughout the war, it was always my endeavour to view my opponent without animus, and to form an opinion of him as a man on

---

[21] Asquith, R., *Pages from a Family Journal 1888-1915* (privately printed, 1916), p. 37, cited in Bergonzi, *Heroes' twilight*, p. 41.
[22] Hynes, *The Soldier's Tale*, p. 39; Ferguson, *The pity of war*, p. 360; Wilson, *The Myriad Faces of War*, p. 10.
[23] Hynes, *The Soldier's Tale*, p. 40.
[24] Hynes, *The Soldier's Tale*, p. 40.
[25] Hynes, *The Soldier's Tale*, p. 41.
[26] Bergonzi, B., *Heroes' twilight*, pp. 37, 45.

the basis of the courage he showed. I would always try to seek him out and kill him, and I expected nothing else from him".[27] By contrast, in his diaries Sassoon only expressed his desire to kill an enemy combatant after he had suffered the traumatic loss of one of his close friends: "I used to say I couldn't kill anyone in this war, but since they shot Tommy, I would gladly stick a bayonet into a German by daylight".[28] This emotional desire for revenge, brought forth by the death of one of Sassoon's friends sits in stark contrast to the response that Junger had to the death of the territorial Deiner, killed by British fire whilst attempting to restore the trench defences. Junger's apathetic reaction to his comrades' efforts to exact revenge on the lone rifleman is best summed up when he says: "They seemed to feel personal enmity for the Britisher who had fired the mortal shot".[29] Junger also demonstrates a sportsman-like attitude towards the enemy on the occasion when he attempts to pinpoint the location of an English rifleman and eliminate him; Junger describes the whole event as a duel.[30]

Both writers also describe the casualties they inflicted in some detail, as, for example, when Sassoon relates his efforts to clear a German strongpoint of snipers: "When I got there I chucked four Mills bombs into their trench and to my surprise fifty or sixty ... ran away like hell into Mametz wood. Our Lewis-gun was on them all the way and I think they suffered".[31] Sassoon's writing here comes across as being somewhat dispassionate and detached from the situation, despite the fact that he has killed a number of people. Junger, likewise, often exhibits a cool and methodical tone when he narrates the details of his military exploits. One example of this can be seen when Junger describes how, in 1917, he and his unit placed themselves in a perfect position to inflict catastrophic losses on an attacking Indian colonial force emerging from a wood.[32] However, in contrast to Sassoon, Junger takes great pride in this achievement. He boasts about how he and his band of only twenty men were able to see off a much larger force, whilst managing to inflict

[27] Junger, E., *Storm of Steel* (London: Penguin, 2004), p. 58.
[28] Hart-Davis, R. (ed.), *Siegfried Sassoon diaries, 1915-1918* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983), p. 52.
[29] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 55.
[30] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 65.
[31] Hart-Davis, R. (ed.), *Siegfried Sassoon diaries*, p. 52.
[32] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 150.

maximum casualties on the enemy. Indeed, he says that it was the kind of engagement of which earlier he could only have dreamed.[33]

Junger also writes extensively about the subject of killing on a much more personal level, for example when he describes picking off unwary British soldiers behind the front line: "I grabbed the nearest sentry's rifle, set the sights to six hundred, aimed quickly just in front of the man's head, and fired".[34] He then stated morbidly that, through his field binoculars, he could see his brown sleeves shining for a long time yet.[35] What can be gleaned from this is that Junger took great pleasure in the mechanics of the kill, something which is absent from Sassoon's war diaries. Throughout his memoirs, it is clear that Junger's military mind is the part of his psyche that most responded to the act of killing. His attitude is especially evident when he describes the killing of two British soldiers who, as part of a ration party, had blundered unknowingly into the German lines:

> They were shot down at point-blank range; one of them landing with his upper body in the defile, while his legs remained on the slope. It was hardly possible to take prisoners in this inferno, and how could we have brought them back through the barrage in any case.[36]

The same uncompromising mind-set can also be seen when a surrendering British soldier was brutally killed:

> One young British soldier had already surrendered to me when he suddenly turned round and disappeared back into his dugout. Then as he stayed there, apparently ignoring my call to come out, we put an end to his dithering with a few hand grenades, and went on.[37]

Clearly, the soldiers who fought in the Great War reacted to the experience of killing in a variety of ways. It is evident that many soldiers not only responded to the experience of killing with equanimity, but also took great pleasure in it. This finding presents a considerable challenge to traditional, over-sentimentalised portrayals of Great War soldiers. Soldiers were not just good pals, or innocent victims of some amorphous entity called 'War'. Neither were they simply "Mechanical Human Beasts", stripped of all feeling and agency by the dehumanising effect of technological innovation.

---

[33] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 151.
[34] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 151.
[35] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 151.
[36] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 151.
[37] Junger, *Storm of Steel*, p. 241.

Rather, they were active, emotional agents who weaved elaborate narratives in order to deal with the extreme circumstances presented by the Great War. They could be unfeeling when confronted with the death of their comrades, and they could also feel exhilaration in the act of killing. Furthermore, some of the instances of killing featured in this paper appear to have served no obvious strategic purpose, but rather seem only to have been carried out in order to sate the bloodlust of the killers. Such behaviour would rightly disgust us in peacetime, but in wartime a love of killing is not only permitted, but often actively encouraged by officers in order to 'work soldiers up' for the fight. Beneath the all-too-comforting stories, which we tell about the Great War, lies a four-year period in which conscience, empathy and charity were all but discarded in favour of animalistic slaughter, in the pursuit of grandiose national and individual motives. As we continue to mark the centenary of the Great War, there is much capital to be made from telling the 'right' story about the War. Surely, therefore, it is timely to recall how truly amoral and barbaric war can be.

CHAPTER TWO

PALS IN ARMS: HOMOSOCIABILITY, HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY AND THE GREAT WAR

JENNY COOK, ASHTON CUNNINGHAM, LEANNE JONES AND MATTHEW WOOD

The Edwardian concept of the towering masculine figure of a household moulded the generation of young men who volunteered to fight in the Great War. From the outset, wartime propaganda emphasised the role of men as protectors of their families and communities, drawing on contemporaneous notions of hegemonic masculinity.[1] Through this propaganda young men were encouraged to be patriotic and it inspired them to fulfil ideals of masculinity and embrace their duty to risk their life for their family and their country. Through the array of posters produced both prior to and during the Great War, young men were manipulated, often through overt emotional blackmail. This is most notable in Saville Lumley's poster *Daddy, What Did You Do in the Great War?,* which was published in 1915.[2] Young men were reminded that their decisions now would have long lasting consequences. As soldiers, men now had to fulfil the ideals of masculinity that had been established throughout the Victorian and Edwardian period. An example of this is a propaganda poster entitled *A Veteran's Farewell*.[3] A young soldier is being greeted by a veteran, dressed in a military uniform, in the background a line of young men are

[1] Connell, R.W. and Messerschmidt, J., 'Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept' *Gender and society,* 19:6 (2005) pp. 829-830

[2] Lumley, S., *Daddy, what did YOU do in the Great War* (1915), Imperial War Museums Collections Website, accessed 25 September 2016, http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/17053

[3] Dadd, F., *A Veteran's farewell* (1917), Imperial War Museums Collections Website, accessed 25 September 2016, http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/205324797

marching to their duty. The veteran is stating that he wishes it were him that was going to war. This image illustrates the pressure that was placed on these young men; they not only had to live up to the expectations of their families and local community, but also they were judged by the ideals developed by the previous generation. The pressure of propaganda can also be seen in a poster produced in 1915, entitled *The Three Types of Men*.[4] This poster states that the three types of men are the ones who obey, the ones who delay, and the ones who are the 'others', encouraging those who had not already enlisted to do so. A religious factor is also prominent with the use of the phrase 'those who hear the call and obey' as it indicates a calling from God. With the phrase 'and the others' groups together the men that had not enlisted as some form of deviant.

The power of these propaganda posters to develop a desire to fulfil locally shared ideals of masculinity can be seen in the development of local regiments, commonly called 'Pals battalions'. The power of the ideals of hegemonic masculinity played a strong part in the recruitment of these units, as men were encouraged to join up together, in order to do their duty as defenders of their nation and communities. The idea of Pals Battalions was to utilise pre-existing relationships between men and to use them as a basis of morale and discipline within the rapidly mobilised volunteer army.

However, responding to the call to join up was not the only challenge young men faced to their masculinity identity. The arena of war could also be a problematic stage for the display of masculine ideals. Letters to loved ones provide important evidence of how soldiers portrayed their ideas, experiences and emotions regarding their participation in the War. Over twelve and a half million letters a week were written over the course of the war. Men wrote letters to reassure their family and describe the events which unfolded in front of them.[5] The appeal to still be seen as remaining true to the masculine ideal becomes apparent throughout the letters, as they provided a means for men to express their heroic masculinity.[6] Many personal letters from the soldiers were in fact censored by their superior officers to filter out the extreme brutality of war and harshness of the war

[4] Anonymous, *There are three types of men* (1915), Imperial War Museums Collections Website, accessed 25 September 2016, http://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30632

[5] Meyer, J., *Men of War, Masculinity and The First World War in Britain* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 14-18

[6] Meyer, *Men of War,* p. 46

in order to maintain morale on the home front. The letters were also self – censored too. The need to maintain military discipline and effectiveness, combined with the expectation that men would naturally cope with the challenges of war, ensured that much of the hardship experienced by the soldiers was not taken seriously or was hidden from view. In particular, those suffering from psychological injuries were often regarded as cowards, or as individuals who had failed the manly test of war. For the most part, men were expected to deal with their war experiences by themselves. The only acceptable form of emotion that a man could express would be grief following the loss of a fellow soldier. The importance of male friendship echoed throughout the war, and units like the Pals Battalions took with them to war the pre-existing friendships from their social circles at home.

The rush to arms of the 'Pals' demonstrated the power of the masculine ideal. However, as the Great War continued it progressively altered how these young men saw themselves. Their views on masculinity and the need for comfort became blurred by the realities of war. Thus, alongside the many social, political and technological advances of the time, the Great War also acted as a catalyst in changing the ideals of hegemonic masculinity. In order to explore these changes this chapter will consider the 11th service battalion, East Lancaster Regiment, more commonly known as the "Accrington Pals". The chapter also considers the case studies of Lance Corporal J.B. Middlebrook, W.P Gooding, Arthur Hubbard and Harold Gillies in order to analyse how these individuals coped with the challenge of fulfilling the masculine ideal in war.

The Pals Battalion initiative was created during the drive for more men to volunteer for the Army, in the first few months of the War. It was hoped that more men could be enticed to join up by giving them the incentive of fighting alongside their neighbours, friends, family and 'workmates'.[7] Entire units were taken from villages, cities, factories and neighbourhoods, thus creating an army that was far from its traditional roots. A good example of a Pals Battalion is the one created in Accrington, where eleven hundred men were recruited.[8] The men of the Regiment fought well alongside each other, offering camaraderie to a level that had never been

[7] Simkins, P., *Kitchener's Army: The Raising of the New Armies, 1914-16* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), p. 91

[8] Further details about The Accrington Pals can be found on a website dedicated to the memory of the11th (Service) Battalion (Accrington) East Lancashire Regiment, http://www.pals.org.uk/pals_e.htm

seen before; this attitude and enthusiasm stayed with the Accrington Pals until the Battle of the Somme. The Somme was the first real fighting they saw and the outcome for the unit was devastating; 584 men were killed, wounded or missing out of a total of 720 who took part in the offensive.[9] As every person was a family member or a friend they had known all their lives, the losses were felt keenly by every individual in the battalion.[10] The huge loss of life within the Pals Battalions not only affected the troops, it was also felt back home in Britain. Whole towns and villages were left to mourn a lost generation of men and those that were lucky enough to return from the war suffered with survivor's guilt.[11] Survivor's guilt not only affected their relationships with friends and family but also had a profound effect on their own mentality. They were left with a feeling of depression as most wondered why they were left alive whereas their friends and comrades were left for dead on a battlefield, far away from home. Many men were left with a feeling of incompleteness and a job not well done, whether this was because of their inability to protect their friends or whether they believed they should have been the ones to have died in their place. All of these emotions had potentially crippling consequences for the surviving soldier's pride. On returning home, some men felt a loss of direction and were left to wonder where they fitted in society.

Friendships between the soldiers were extremely important. The soldiers of the Great War fought together and their leisure time was spent together, this meant that they formed very strong bonds. For many men the ability to fight on the front line was fuelled by the need for revenge for their friends that had been killed.[12] During the war, male friendship provided the soldiers with a "stable anchoring point [in] a world of crisis."[13] The Great War challenged the pre-war Edwardian concepts of manliness, which included repressed fear, toughness, stoic endurance and emotional

[9] The Accrington Pals website: http://www.pals.org.uk/pals_e.htm
[10] Wilkinson, R., *Pals on the Somme 1916* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books, 2006)
[11] Morrow, J., *The Great War: An Imperial History*. (London: Routledge, 2004) pp. 318
[12] Shaw, M., 'How did soldiers cope with war?' British Library Website, accessed 25 September 2016, http://www.bl.uk/world-war-one/articles/how-did-soldiers-cope-with-war
[13] Cole, S., 'Modernism, male intimacy and the Great War', *English Literary History*, 68:2 (2001), p. 469.

restraint.[14] Alistair Thomson argues that "[m]asculine identities [were] forged and lived in a dynamic tension between the subjective experiences of individual men and shifting social expectations of appropriate masculine behaviour."[15] Under the pressure of war, many men developed intense and intimate forms of friendship. Therefore, male friendship as a result of the war challenged the soldier's own ideas of masculinity. Men would look after each other when wounded or ill, wrap blankets around each other and sleep within close proximity.[16] These close forms of friendship went against the rigid principles of manliness of pre-war Britain and against what was deemed as 'proper behaviour' within the army. Prior to the Great War some of these expressions of close male friendship would have been perceived as effeminate and therefore officers would be prejudiced against men who were seen to have formed too close an emotional bond.[17] Although Susan Grayzel argues that the basic ideas about gender remained consistent throughout the war, the soldiers of the Great War no longer knew what masculinity meant to them. As Joanna Bourke asserts, "the need for emotion was never as intense as when faced with mortality".[18] In the one sense they were fulfilling the role of the heroic soldier, yet on the other hand they experienced deep fear as well as intimate friendships with their fellow soldiers, all of which went against the strict Edwardian masculine ideals. It is a great irony that the Great War, which treated the male body with such brutality, "nurtured the most intense and intimate of male bonds."[19]

---

[14] Roper, M., 'Between manliness and masculinity: the "war generation" and the psychology of fear in Britain, 1914–1950', *Journal of British Studies*, 44:2 (2005), pp 343-62.

[15] Thomson, A., 'A crisis of masculinity? Australian military manhood in the Great War' in Lake, M. and Damousi, J. (eds.) *Gender and War: Australians at war in the twentieth century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 133

[16] Das, S., 'Sensuous life in the trenches' British Library Website, accessed 26 March 2014, http://www.bl.uk/world-war-one/articles/sensuous-life-in-the-trenches

[17] Grayzel, S.R., 'Changing lives: gender expectations and roles during and after World War One', British Library Website, accessed 26 March 2014, http://www.bl.uk/world-war-one/articles/changing-lives-gender-expectations#

[18] Bourke, J., *Dismembering the male: Men's bodies, Britain and the Great War* (London: Reaktion, 1999), p. 25

[19] Das, S., 'The Dying Kiss: Gender and Intimacy in the Trenches of World War I', World War I Centenary Website, accessed 31 March 2014, http://ww1centenary.oucs.ox.ac.uk/body-and-mind/the-dying-kiss-gender-and-intimacy-in-the-trenches-of-world-war-i

The men returning to domestic roles after the war often experienced this return differently, depending on whether or not they became physically or mentally disabled after their experiences in the trenches. It was assumed that men would quickly readjust to their peacetime employment and easily slip back into their traditional roles in society.[20] The Edwardian ideals of masculinity focused heavily on the idea of the man as the breadwinner and sole provider for his family. Those who returned mentally scarred or physically injured and dismembered, found themselves unable to meet traditional expectations and were commonly pitied as emasculated individuals.[21] Men who were still relatively young wanted to continue in the world of work instead of relying on the pensions, which were given out to a substantial number of soldiers after the war, or relying on the earnings of wives and children.[22]

One of the major disabilities that resulted from soldiers' experiences in the Great War was shell shock. This was relatively wide spread; there are no accurate figures as to how many men suffered from it as it was often ignored or dismissed, particularly in the early years of the War. Due to the fact that this condition was often not recognised, many men were expected to fight on and deal with the symptoms themselves. Soldiers who suffered from the psychological impact of war frequently faced ridicule from the army and from society as a whole. Joanna Bourke uses the example of Arthur Hubbard to show the effects of shell shock and how he was treated by his fellow combatants.[23] Hubbard was targeted by a few soldiers and officers referring to him as a coward whenever he displayed signs of emotional weakness. Individuals like Hubbard were no longer conforming to expectations of masculine behaviour, which was unsettling for their comrades and for the individuals themselves. In his poem 'Survivors', Siegfried Sassoon writes about the impact that shell shock had upon male pride. He often refers to sufferers from shell shock as children, not to insult the soldiers, but instead to emphasise their childlike tendencies in respect to the display of fear.[24] Such emotional displays were deemed unmanly. For men who had fought in the War and who suffered emotional

[20] Meyer, *Men of War*, p. 97
[21] Shermen, D., 'Monuments, mourning and masculinity in France after World War One', *Gender and History*, 8:1 (1994) pp. 82-107
[22] Meyer, *Men of War*, p. 106
[23] Bourke, J., 'Shell shock during World War One', BBC History Website, accessed 25 September 2016,
http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/wwone/shellshock_01.shtml
[24] Sassoon, Siegfried, *Survivors* (October 1917) cited in Bourke, 'Shell shock',

and psychological trauma as a consequence, it came as a severe blow to have their status as a soldier and as a man diminished because of something out of their control.[25]

Turning to physical disabilities, Wendy Gagen's research provides the example of Lance Corporal J.B. Middlebrook, highlighting the crisis of masculinity he suffered after he lost his left arm in 1916.[26] Gagen studied the private letters which he sent to his family. In his earlier letters, when he wrote about his injury, he ensured the pain and agony he felt was not discussed as he wanted to live up to the image of the ideal masculine patient.[27] Repression of emotion was what was expected of men in the trenches, and it is challenging for historians to identify certain underlying feelings portrayed in letters and personal correspondences without the letters identifying with easily recognisable masculine behaviours.[28] Middlebrook's later letters began to reveal how he truly felt, showing his need for comfort from his parents.

Middlebrook was not an isolated example; just fewer than five hundred thousand individuals were in receipt of artificial limbs, mobility aid or in need of some form of surgical appliances. Jessica Meyer has argued that these men, in physically losing part of their body, were seen to have lost their masculinity too.[29] The main issue was the lack of employment opportunities for disabled men and therefore the inability for them to provide for their families. Meyer uses the example of a schoolmaster, W.P. Gooding, and highlights how he relied on the help from his family doctor to hide his inability to work to an efficient standard.[30] Whether it was a mental or physical issue, the inability to slip back into the world of work immediately after the war was what challenged the Edwardian template of masculinity most of all.

Men suffering from facial injuries and disfigurement often felt particularly marginalised and emasculated. There were around 60,500 soldiers who

---

[25] Bourke, 'Shell shock'
[26] Gagen, W.J., 'Remastering the body, renegotiating gender: Physical disability and masculinity during the First World War, the case of J.B. Middlebrook', *European Review Of History*, 14:4 (2007), p. 528
[27] Gagen, 'Remastering the body', pp. 530-531
[28] Connell and Messerschmidt 'Hegemonic masculinity', pp. 836-837
[29] Meyer, *Men of War,* pp. 97, 113
[30] Meyer, *Men of War*, p. 111

were injured in their head or their eyes as a result of the war.[31] Katherine Feo uses the case study of Dr Harold Gilles, a doctor from New Zealand, who in 1916 established his own wing of a hospital in Aldershot, where he received over 2,000 soldiers requiring facial reconstruction surgery after the battle of the Somme. Feo states that for many of the men under Dr Gillies' care, their main motivation for the surgery was to re-establish their sense of ability to work, as there was a common belief that there was a correlation between being seen as injured and a lack of productivity.[32]

The concept of masculinity changed due to the impact of the First World War, from the enforcement of the image of a 'dominating man' propagated by social and cultural norms, to the demands from the emotional blackmail produced in various sources of propaganda. The end of the War brought home the survivors and the trauma they had experienced, both physical injuries and mental ones. The physical injuries the men experienced during the War meant that some men could no longer be the primary breadwinner for the family. The Edwardian ideal of a man was one where he was always the sole provider for his household; if a man could not even fulfil his most basic role, what use was he to his family. Historians such as Meyer, Gagen and Katherine Feo have analysed soldier's disabilities and how they coped after the war. They have established different case studies to show how some men did not want the sympathies of their families and loved ones as they tried to keep intact the Edwardian template of how a man should act and what a man should say. However, generalisation is impossible, as another segment of men were just as emotionally unstable but were not afraid to display said emotions to loved ones.

Jessica Meyer has studied the changes men in the armed forces faced both during and after the war. She uses case studies from various soldier's letters to home to establish a generalised argument concerning the changing face of manhood. The creation of the Pals Battalion forced levels of friendship and love for fellow soldiers that had never been seen on the battlefield before. This had a catastrophic effect on both soldiers and their loved ones in Britain; it not only affected morale but it also changed men's perspective of masculinity through being closer to their fellow soldiers. The government latched onto the concept exploiting the Pals Battalion idea and the male bonding it could offer in a way of friendship and a way to prove one's courage.

---

[31] Feo, K, 'Invisibility: Memory, Masks and Masculinities in the Great War', *Journal of Design History,* 20:1 (2001) pp. 19-21
[32] Feo, 'Invisibility', pp. 19-21

Survivor's guilt became a major issue after the war, alongside emotional trauma. The survivors of the Great War did their best to go along with slipping back into society as if everything was 'business as usual.' Through the external face that they presented, men did their best to keep traditions alive and so to preserve the appearance of social and familial stability. In private a substantial number of men had developed to a new emotional level where they were able to comfortably talk about their horrific experiences of war with their loved ones; whether this meant talking with their parents, their spouse or even a fellow soldier. The War ensured that the privacy and repression that had been a key feature of Edwardian hegemonic masculinity had to be reassessed, and it contributed to the development of new forms of masculinity.

CHAPTER THREE

BEYOND *WAR HORSE*: ANIMALS AND TOTAL WAR

VICKI FORDHAM, SOPHIE BIRCH, CALVIN SMITH AND RYAN KHAIRA

Due to the prominence of the war horse in popular depictions of the First World War, from General Jack Seeley's *Warrior: The Amazing Story of a Real War Horse* to Michael Morpurgo's *War Horse,* the importance of the horse within the conflict has been increasingly recognised in recent decades. Exports of horses to the battlefield reached in excess of one million from Britain alone and Richard van Emden suggests that throughout the first year, the animal labour force was an "overwhelmingly equine" affair.[1] In reality only 2% of the British Army was mounted upon horseback, as most horses were used for transporting goods, and both the Entente and the Central powers relied upon a variety of animals in order to transport, supply and fight the enemy.[2] The horse was not alone in playing an important role within the conflict. This paper will illustrate the dependency on a variety of animals, other than horses, that contributed to the Total War effort. The role of animals in shaping the morale of soldiers at the Front will be considered, alongside an assessment of their specialist roles.[3]

Camels formed mounted corps in the Middle East, providing vital transportation for both soldiers and munitions across desert terrain.[4]

---

[1] van Emden, R., *Tommy's Ark: Soldiers and their Animals in the Great War* (London: Bloomsbury, 2010), p. 18

[2] Tucker, C.S. and Roberts, M.P. (ed.*) The Encyclopaedia of World War I: A Political, Social and Military History* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO Ltd., 2005), p. 103

[3] Baynes, E.H., *Animal Heroes of the Great War* (London: The MacMillan Company, 1925) pp. 4-5

[4] Baynes, *Animal Heroes*, p. 103

Communications on the Western Front also depended on a variety of animals to function adequately, as dogs and pigeons carried orders across lines of communication.[5] Belligerent nations also relied upon animals at home, within both industry and agriculture. The ways in which animals enabled production lines to run smoother is also explored, with specific emphasis on the use of exotic animals after their temporary release from menageries.[6] There was also a growth in animal welfare associations such as the Blue Cross and the RSPCA, which reflected fears that animals were being mistreated.[7] As Keith Neilson posits, the First World War was the original Total War.[8] The scale of the effort involved required the mobilisation of every available resource, including animals.[9]

Karl Marx noted that "the redeeming feature of war is that it puts a nation to the test".[10] In 1914, as the conflict was expected to end by Christmas, there was little expectation for the need of non-combatants to play a role.[11] However, civilian contributions towards the war effort were soon viewed to be "as vital" as those of the military; as the Front extended more sacrifices were made as families donated money, time and their other assets to the cause.[12] This included their pets and other livestock, and many nations mobilised their animal population to aid the push towards victory. The use of animals provided some unlikely solutions, with variable results, to a series of problems on the Home Front. For example, most circus entertainment in Britain came to a halt during the First World War, due to the strain on the economy and the restrictions on travel and freedoms

---

[5] Hicks, P., *Animal Bravery in Wartime: Beyond the Call of Duty* (London: Wayland, 2014), pp. 6, 14.
Gardiner, J., *The Animals' War: Animals in Wartime from the First World War to the Present Day* (London: Portrait, 2006), p. 94
[6] Smith, S. (ed.) *John Ling's Memories of a Travelling Life* (Staffordshire: The Fairground Association of Great Britain, 1992) pp. 6-7
[7] Emden, *Tommy's Ark*, p. 177
[8] Neilson, K., 'Total War: Total History' *Military Affairs* 51.1 (1987), p. 17
[9] Chickering, R., and Forster, S., 'Introduction' in Chickering, R., and Forster, S. (ed.) *Great War, Total War: Combat and Mobilisation on the Western Front, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 2
[10]Marwick, Arthur, *Britain in the Century of Total War* (London: Penguin Books, 1968), p. 13
[11] Chickering and Forster, 'Introduction', p. 4
[12] Crook, P., *Darwinism, War and History: The Debate over the Biology of War from the "Origin of Species" to the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 100

under the Defence of the Realm Act.[13] The animals were then leased to fulfil menial tasks and replace the absent horses.[14] The use exotic animals within industrial and agricultural work was therefore not an uncommon occurrence during the First World War. Elephants were documented as being used in the fields within Surrey and Horley. They were also used in German farms where they aided heavy "lifting and haulage". Elephants could carry out the same level of work that it took three horses to complete, and so they could provide essential support to the war economy in regards to the production of industry and agricultural goods.[15] This led to some exotic animals being seen within urban environments. For example, within Sheffield an elephant, named Lizzie, and some camels were hired by Thomas Ward steelworks to aid with transportation. Lizzie had originally been part of Sedgewick's Menagerie, and it is further presumed that the camels came from the same place.[16] Lizzie became something of a local celebrity and was documented as having quite a character with several tales having been recorded about the elephant. These included incidents where she ate someone's hat, stole a pie through a window and played in a goal during the Steel City Derby.[17] *The World's Fair Newspaper* claimed that the elephant strode through the city with "ease" whilst the remaining horses were "startled" and "sniffed" at the presence of the elephant.[18] The use of unusual animals in everyday situations enabled the newspapers to report on the Great War but to also include accounts of humorous events in order to lift the morale of those on the Home Front.

Some exotic animals were also used on the battlefield. The German army used elephants to plough fields, for heavy lifting and to pull large items

---

[13] 'Additional regulations added to the Defence Against the Realm Act, September 1914', accessed 1 May 2014, http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/britain1906to1918/pdf/complete_g5_cs1.pdf; Verney, P., *Here Comes the Circus* (London: Paddington Press Ltd., 1978), p. 71

[14] Smith, *John Ling's Memories,* p. 7

[15] Smith, *John Ling's Memories,* p. 6; 'Food Preparedness New Phase of World War' *Popular Mechanics* May 1917 accessed 24 March 2014, http://oldmagazinearticles.com/use_of_elephants_in_modern_war_pdf

[16] Smith, *John Ling's Memories,* p. 7

[17] Skews, Jonathan, *Sheffield: A Pocket Miscellany* (Gloucestershire: The History Press, 2012), p. 116

[18] *World's Fair Newspaper,* cited in Tarver, Nick, 'World War One: The Circus Animals that Helped Britain', BBC News website, accessed 27 January 2014 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-24745705

within Northern France.[19] In the case of some other animals, their utilisation was less surprising. The Fast Riding Camel Corps consisted of the Bikanir and Arab species that were frequently employed to transport the soldiers to the battlefield, where soldiers would proceed to fight as infantry.[20] The Imperial Camel Corps was founded in 1916 specifically for combat in the Middle East, in order to defend Egypt from the Turkish.[21] Camels were very valuable to the regiments as they could carry in excess of 385lbs, resulting in forty to fifty thousand camels being used in Syria in the fight against the enemy.[22] Not only were camels strong, but they could withstand long distances and extreme desert conditions. The creation of the Imperial Camel Corps in the Middle East enabled regiments to advance in battle more quickly, as well as improving the transportation of valuable resources and ammunition.[23] Not only were these animals used to form corps to transport people and supplies for battle, but they also provided transportation of the wounded and sick soldiers. Clearly, in the eastern theatres of battle the use of camels in replacement of horse regiments was important for success. These animals were adapted to the various terrains encountered within the Middle East, and, unlike horses, could cope with excessive heat and a lack of food and water.[24]

Domestic animals played a crucial role in the Forces too. Due to their heightened senses of sight, smell and hearing, dogs were frequently utilised, and they were often conscripted from family homes, much like their human counterparts. At the outbreak of war, Germany had the upper hand with the utilisation of dogs; six thousand dogs were ready to go into service in Germany, whereas there was only one in Britain. However in 1916, there was the creation of the War Dog's School to develop their skills as messenger dogs, and were most importantly trained to become desensitised to explosions. Airedales, Collies and Whippets were eventually designated the proficient messenger dogs, and were further trusted with guarding stores, rations and trenches.[25] Perhaps the most

[19] Emden, *Tommy's Ark*, p. 53
[20] Baynes, *Animal Heroes of the Great War*, p. 103
[21] 'Imperial Camel Corps, Australian War Memorial', Australian War Memorial Website, accessed 26 March 2014, http://www.awm.gov.au/units/unit_13624.asp
Cooper, Jilly, *Animals in War* (Great Britain: William Heinenman Ltd., 1983), p. 125
[22] Baynes, *Animal Heroes of the Great War*, p. 71
[23] Cooper, *Animals in War*, pp. 117, 124
[24] Gardiner, *The Animals' War*, pp. 55, 127
[25] Cooper, Jilly, *Animals in War*, pp. 6, 75

famous example of any single animal contribution to the war was a bull terrier, Stubby. Stubby, who was smuggled into France and later became the most highly decorated and ranked animal that served in the Great War for the United States; at the end of the war he ranked higher than his owner, Private J. Robert Conroy.[26] His medals were a direct result of his bravery and intelligence; he foiled German infiltrations, artillery and gas attacks, that otherwise would have decimated Stubby's division. After nearly losing his life to a gas attack, Stubby developed a sensitive sense of smell to gas and he became a vital warning system to the soldiers around him, saving lives on countless occasions. Stubby further received the rank of sergeant after catching a German soldier trespassing on the Allied lines.[27]

Dogs did not just play a functional role. Many soldiers were keen to have some semblance of a normal life while on the Front, and so the animal presence could provide ample distraction, and a reminder of home. Gordon Fuller claims that morale is based on more than the amount of food and munitions that battalions received; he posits that emotions and the relationships formed during war time were crucial to maintaining morale.[28] Numerous poems and diary entries testify that an animal's presence provided comfort and companionship to those at the battlefront, stimulating emotional responses that were becoming unfamiliar abroad.[29] So, following an incident of a German grenade attack, when Stubby was left injured and hospitalised, upon his recovery he boosted the morale of soldiers within the hospital.[30] The case of Stubby shows the contribution of animals to the Total War effort; not only did a previously domestic dog boost the morale of fellow troops but he also served amongst soldiers, with his own personal contribution of saving the life of his soldier comrades.

Animals like Stubby soon gained a special status within the Forces, and many were recognised as Mascots. These animals aided the Total War

---

[26] National Museum of American History, *The Price of Freedom Americans at War, Object Records, Stubby*
http://amhistory.si.edu/militaryhistory/collection/object.asp?ID=15 Date Accessed: 14 March 2014; le Chene, E., *Silent Heroes: The Bravery and Devotion of Animals in War* (London: Souvenir Press, 1994), p. 162
[27] Chene, *Silent Heroes*, pp. 162, 169
[28] Fuller, J., *Troop Morale and Popular Culture in the British and Dominion Armies 1914-1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 29
[29] Hicks, *Animal Bravery in Wartime*, p. 27
[30] Chene, *Silent Heroes*, p. 170-1

effort in many ways, often having significant jobs within the regiments, as well as increasing morale. Naval Forces were particular advocates of mascots, having collected a small menagerie of exotic animals from their escapades abroad. These included a brown bear, who provided companionship and lifted morale on the HMS Royal Oak.[31] The practicality of animals was also considered at sea; cats were frequently kept on the ships to decrease the population of rats and mice and farm livestock was transported on the vessels as a direct means of food.[32] Superstition was also another factor for keeping specific animals on board the ships: cats were presumed to be lucky and thought to predict the weather through their behaviour.[33] The Royal Navy was not the only fleet to have animals aboard its ships; one German ship, the *Dresden* had a pig on board which was rescued by the British after they sunk the ship.[34] The pig became a mascot for the British and was named Tirpitz, after the German Admiral.[35] The Australian HMAS Melbourne crew also acquired the companionship of a parrot known as Robert, in addition to two dogs and a cat abroad. Robert was the favourite amongst the crew members, aiding the band with his musical squawking. It has also been documented that Robert enjoyed the company of the crew as much as they enjoyed his; Robert would spend his spare time on many occasions pulling the buttons off crew member's uniform.[36] The use of mascots not only provided a useful service to the regiments within the Great War but they also provided affection for the soldiers, with positive results for the maintenance of morale.[37]

Other animals were co-opted into the war effort for very specific roles. During the conflict there was a considerable concern about gas attacks, and so any animal, ranging from cows to rodents and insects, was examined for their sense of smell.[38] Whilst dogs were the preferred choice

---

[31] Hicks, *Animal Bravery in Wartime*, pp. 27, 146.
[32] Storey, N.R., *Animals in the First World War* (Oxford: Shire Publications, 2014), p. 13; Hicks, *Animal Bravery in Wartime*, p. 26
[33] Storey, *Animals in the First World War*, p. 15
[34] Gardiner, *The Animals' War*, p. 127
[35]Storey, *Animals in the First World War*, p. 13; Gardiner, *The Animals' War*, p. 152; Hicks, *Animal Bravery in Wartime*, p. 26
[36] Hill, Anthony, *Animal Heroes* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2005), pp. 48-9.
[37] Hicks, *Animal Bravery in Wartime*, p. 27
[38] Devlin, P.R., 'Animal Heroes of the Great War (Part II): A courageous dog, a heroic pigeon, and the amazing garden slug!' *Manchester Patch* Website. Accessed Online: http://manchester.patch.com/groups/opinion/p/animal-heroes-of-the-great-war-part-ii-a-courageous-d21e2c2543c Date Accessed: 12th March 2014

for gas detection, the everyday Garden Slug proved to be the most efficient and accurate detector of gas. Dr Paul Bartsch discovered that some slugs displayed signs of irritation and respiration difficulties in the presence of gases, especially Mustard gas. Dr Bartsch's deductive reasoning led him to the discovery that slugs are sensitive to gases, in concentrations far lower than a human can detect.[39] This meant that even the smallest of animals helped towards the Total War effort as slugs became frequently used within the trenches. Other animals were less easy to control. The use of sea lions was also considered within the Great War to detect the use of submarines with training involving starvation and large rewards of fish. However, this method of submarine detection resulted in an inconsistent result; not all sea lions would stay focused on the task at hand.[40] However, the attempt to use animals such as these does display the evident need for all possible resources within a complex and multifaceted war effort.

It was not just through official procedures that animals became part of the conflict, but also though informal use by personnel. Cockfighting was a common occurrence within French cafes, which provided entertainment for soldiers until the sport was banned in 1916.[41] The popularity of the sport can be seen by the fact that a number of the cockerels were also adopted as mascots for various battalions within France. An Australian regiment also had ownership of one of the most well-known fighting roosters within France, who was known as Billy, whilst another regiment had a rooster that acted as a guard dog.[42] Sporting events involving animals boosted morale and soldiers proceeded to invent their own games utilising the surrounding trench pests; dogs in the trenches often caught the rats which frequently provided a form of indirect competition amongst the soldiers.[43] In one letter home, Lieutenant James Foulis described the entertainment rats had provided; on one occasion, after capturing live rats, they were thrown into the opposing German trenches via the use of a bomb dispenser.[44] This highlights the fact that although animals aided the war effort, animal cruelty was often overlooked if it increased morale. While it was common for soldiers to busy themselves with the capture of

[39] Reginald, A.H. *Researches on fungi, volume II* (London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1922), pp. 234-5.
[40] Gardiner, *The Animals' War*, p. 107-8
[41] Emden, *Tommy's Ark*, p. 72
[42] Hill, *Animal Heroes*, pp.46-8, 59.
[43] Lieutenant Edmund Fischer cited in Emden, *Tommy's Ark*, pp. 223-4
[44] Lieutenant James Foulis cited in Emden, *Tommy's Ark*, p. 102.

rats, mice and moles within the trenches, there were documented feelings of guilt within diary entries.[45] There was some acknowledgement that the sport, although frequently enjoyed, was akin to what the soldiers were experiencing; death on a regular basis. However, they provided essential distraction, and there appears to have been a grim enjoyment in their treatment of trench pests.

Because of this use and abuse of animals, animal welfare associations became involved in the conflict. During the First World War, there were organisations in place to help implement animal welfare procedures and help provide animals with the care that they needed. The RSPCA and the Blue Cross both provided care for animals that were serving on both the home and western front. As well as increasing animal welfare, this enabled more jobs to become available, such as the number of Veterinary Corps personnel increased from 1,300 to 43,000 people.[46] Over the course of the war two and half million animals were admitted to the RSPCA, with over eighty percent of them being successfully treated and returning to their roles within the war.[47] In 1914 the RSPCA created a fund to aid suffering horses on the front line.[48] This helped to fund thirteen Veterinary hospitals, which included an operating theatre and ambulances that were specifically designed for the removal of horses from the front line.[49] As a result of the First World War, the US Armed Forces provided veterinary officers in order to deliver a greater level of care for animals at war from 1916.[50] The Army Veterinary Corps began in 1796, "when the veterinary profession itself was in its primacy".[51] Despite this long history, the profession was yet to be established; in 1914, there were only five hundred

---

[45] Captain Phillip Gosse and Thomas Hope, cited in Emden, Emden, *Tommy's Ark*, pp. 225-7

[46] Army Services Medical Museum website, accessed 23 March 2014, http://www.ams-museum.org.uk/museum/history/ravc-history/

[47] 'The Royal Army Veterinary Corps History: 200 Years of History' *British Army Website,* accessed 24 March 2014, http://www.army.mod.uk/documents/general/ravc_history.pdf

[48] RSPCA website, accessed 18 March 2014, http://www.rspca.org.uk/in-action/aboutus/heritage/firstworldwar/sickandwounded

[49] 'Royal Army Veterinary Corps' Army Services Medical Museum website, accessed 23 March 2014, http://www.ams-museum.org.uk/museum/history/ravc-history/

[50] 'Veterinary Corps', US Army Medical Department website, accessed 28 March 2014, http://veterinarycorps.amedd.army.mil/history.htm

[51] 'Brief history of the RABC', *British* Army website, accessed 25 March 2014, http://www.army.mod.uk/medical-services/veterinary/30496.aspx

and nineteen men within the corps, but this increased to eighteen thousand by 1918.[52] Overall, two and a half million soldiers under the RAVC successfully treated 80% of injured animals.[53] It is therefore evident that these organisations and their workforces aided the animals' contribution to the Total War effort. The animal welfare organisations enabled the humane care and treatment of animals, and their work continues today.[54] The charity Animal Aid founded the Purple Poppy appeal in 2007 to commemorate the lives lost by animals in war.[55] Also, following the publication of Jilly Cooper's *Animals in War,* there was a campaign that resulted in the design and creation of Hyde Park's animal memorial. The monument displays the gratitude to the animals that the nation feels whilst emphasising that they "had no choice".[56] America also has animal memorials, which concentrate heavily on the involvement of dogs and horses, whilst Scotland has a cemetery dedicated to soldiers' dogs.[57] The memorials, alongside the Purple Poppy appeal are dedicated to the contributions made by animals of all species during the Great War.

It can therefore be seen that animals were a vital resource throughout the duration of the First World War. Animals provided transportation for troops, injured personnel and provided armies with a range of transport types, some of which could travel over longer distances and faster than the standard horse. Animals within the war effort also provided companionship and entertainment for the soldiers, whether it was in the form of a mascot or through the activities such as rat catching and cockerel fighting. Skills developed by animals were vital to the Total War effort; dogs developed sensitivity to the smell of gas, and slugs were able to detect gas five times quicker than a human. On the Front some animals proved to possess the key qualities and skills of a soldier, while at Home they also played a key role providing skills that were needed in the war economy. Undoubtedly, the horse played a crucial role in the Great War,

---

[52] Emden, *Tommy's Ark*, p. 71

[53] 'The Royal Army Veterinary Corps History: 200 Years of History' British Army Website, accessed 24 March 2014,
http://www.army.mod.uk/documents/general/ravc_history.pdf

[54] Storey, *Animals in the First World*, p. 53

[55] 'Purple Poppy to Commemorate Animal Victims', Animal Aid website, accessed 2 May 2014,
http://www.animalaid.org.uk/h/n/NEWS/news_other/ALL/1689//

[56] Gardiner, *The Animals' War*, p. 187; Storey, *Animals in the First World*, p. 53

[57] Gardiner, *The Animals' War*, p. 186

but it is important to remember that a diverse range of animals contributed to the Total War effort.

CHAPTER FOUR

"TICKLING MEN TO WAR": THE WHITE FEATHER CAMPAIGN

VICTORIA HAMMONDS, TRACEY HANDLEY, JAMES MALLEY AND REBECCA STURGESS

A "brutal battle that shattered countries" and "bloody massacres" is how P. Hart describes the First World War.[1] It would be wrong, however, to deduce that all the fighting of the Great War took place on the battlefields. Those men left on the Home Front were also faced with a "swift and merciless assault"; "a danger far more terrible than anything they [could] meet in battle".[2] This was the White Feather Campaign. On 30 August 1914, twenty six days after the initiation of the First World War, Admiral Charles Penrose Fitzgerald commissioned thirty women from Folkestone to distribute white feathers, a traditional emblem of cowardice, to 'shirkers'; un-uniformed men, who were not signed up to fight for their country.[3] The sole aim of this movement was to bring shame upon and de-masculinise any able-bodied men in civilian dress, in order to encourage them to join the British Army.

Through the analysis of recruitment statistics, personal accounts and newspapers, this chapter argues that, in 1914, the white feather was an effective weapon in war, both as an agent for female emancipation and as

[1] Hart, P., 'The White Feather Campaign: A Struggle with Masculinity During World War I', accessed 2 April 2014, http://www.studentpulse.com/articles/151/the-white-feather-campaign-a-struggle-with-masculinity-during-world-war-i

[2] Hart, 'The White Feather Campaign'; 'The White Feather', accessed 18 July 2015, http://www.ppu.org.uk/poppy/new/tx_feather.html

[3] Gullance, N. F., 'White feathers and wounded men, patriotism and the memory of the Great War', *Journal of British Studies,* 36.2 (1997). pp. 178-179; Gullance, F.N., 'The Blood of Our sons, Men, Women, and the Renegotiation of British Citizenship during the Great War', *The Journal of Modern History*, 77.3 (2005), pp. 780-782.

a wartime recruiting tool. However, by 1915 the campaign had become tarnished and had gained a negative reputation through media attention, with the women handing out the feathers often being teased and condemned for their actions. The growing criticism of the women's actions resulted in government measures being put into place in 1916, in order to resolve the problems that the White Feather had caused.

Before looking into the significance of the White Feather in the period of the War, it is first important to look at the background and motives of the women involved in the campaign. Women of all ages, from the young flapper to the grieving mother and the militant suffragette, were recruited to the campaign of handing out the feathers[4]. As Woollacott points out, some of the flappers were as young as thirteen.[5] Many of the young ladies who handed out the white feather did so in order to be seen following a trend and to be fashionable.[6] This 'trendiness' is addressed by N.F. Gullance, who describes how the practice was imitated by women and girls across the United Kingdom.[7] Another type of woman who was likely to hand out the white feather was a mother whose son was away fighting at war.[8] Many such women felt great anger upon seeing an un-uniformed man at home while their child was away risking their life for their country, thus motivating them to shame these cowards. The suffragettes also played a significant role in handing out the white feather to ununiformed men. Emmeline Pankhurst held the strongest of these views. She believed that men should be fighting and demanded that there should be some form of conscription implemented so that men had to go to war. Pankhurst toured the country making innumerable speeches in which she proclaimed that "the least that men can do is, that everyman of fighting age should prepare himself to redeem his word to women".[9] This demonstrated that Pankhurst

[4] Gullance, 'White feathers and wounded men'; Ellsworth- Jones, W., *We Will Not Fight – The Untold story of World War one's Conscientious Objectors* (London: Aurum, 2008), p. 46; Woolacott, A., '"Khaki Fever" and its control: Gender, Class, Age and Sexual Morality on the British Homefront in the First World War', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 29.2 (1994), pp. 325-347; Hart, 'The White Feather Campaign'.

[5] Woolacott, '"Khaki Fever" and its control'.

[6] Ellsworth-Jones, W., *We Will Not Fight: The Untold story of World War one's Conscientious Objectors* (London: Aurum, 2008), p. 52

[7] Gullance, 'White feathers and wounded men'

[8] Lee, E., cited in Ellsworth-Jones, *We Will Not Fight,* p. 52

[9] Simmers, G., 'White Feathers : Stories of Courage, Recruitment and Gender at the start of the Great War', https://greatwarfiction.wordpress.com/white-feathers-stories-of-courage-cowardice-and-recruitment-at-the-start-of-the-great-war/

thought men had an unspoken promise to women to protect them: men should therefore sign up to the British army and fight to protect their loved ones; as this would help enforce their masculinity.[10]

Britain's Call to Arms by Frank William Brangwyn, 1914, © TfL from the London Transport Museum collection

Why did these women hand out the white feather? Hart argues that the campaign was enforced as a battle with the gender ideals of the time; both the manipulation of masculinity and the fight for female emancipation. Hart commences his article by discussing the pre-war female gender ideals stating how "women were always the lesser gender in England, overshadowed by the dominance of their male counterpart." This highlights that in the time predating the First World War women's opinions were not highly valued and they were seen as the inferior sex.[11] P. Ward in '"Women of Britain Say Go": women's patriotism in the First World War', describes how this idea was quick to alter in 1914, noting: "Women were encouraged to participate in the war effort (…) a chance that they seized with great vigour"[12]. This argument is echoed further by Hart, who states that the handing out of white feathers gave the women involved a sense of power over the men who had prior to this period, ruled over them. This accentuates the idea that women handed out the white feather as it was a way of battling the gender ideals that they had been constricted to for years previously. By handing out this symbol of

[10] Hart, 'The White Feather Campaign'
[11] Hart, 'The White Feather Campaign'.
[12] Ward, P., '"Women of Britain Say Go": women's patriotism in the First World War', *Twentieth Century British History* 12:1 (2001), pp. 23-45

cowardice, these women were showing the power of manipulation that they held over men. During this period a strange phenomenon occurred known as 'Khaki Fever'; this was when young women, including girls as young thirteen, were overcome with great excitement and sexual desire as a result of seeing a man in uniform. It was in this excitable state that they handed out White Feathers and promised sexual favours to the men who they pressed into putting on the uniform of the king.[13] This 'fever', however, soon got out of hand and became very aggressive, with one woman stating that "if you are not in khaki by the 20th, I will cut you down".[14] Such behaviour appeared to demonstrate an alteration in the female gender ideals of the period, which had placed emphasis on the woman being a pure and innocent being.[15] The aforementioned women, who handed out white feathers, would often get a sense of duty from doing so: the white feather women saw it as their chance to actively participate in the war, something that would be unthinkable previously, thus showing that the white feather was an effective way of battling gender ideals.

At the start of the war, the white feather can be seen to have been a very effective and efficient recruiting weapon. This can be closely linked into the ideas mentioned above, with the man as the protector and provider of the family. This can be seen through the wartime recruitment poster (fig 1.). The image shows a soldier pointing towards the war, indicating that it was a man's duty to go and fight, in order to protect his wife and child. The poster, published in 1914, was reinforcing pre-war ideas of masculinity and the role of the man as the protector of his family.[16] This is a point that was also exploited in a poster issued by the Parliamentary Recruiting Committee, which stated "Do you realise that the safety of your home and children depends on our getting more men NOW?"[17] Effectively, the propaganda employed emotional blackmail to encourage men to hurry to the recruiting offices.

---

[13] Woolacott, '"Khaki Fever" and its control'.
[14] Ethel, M., Personal Column in *The Times*, 8 July 1915.
[15] Hart, 'The White Feather Campaign'
[16] 'Recruitment War Poster' (1914), Transport for London Collection, accessed 25 September 2016, http://www.20thcenturylondon.org.uk/ltm-1983-4-11922
[17] Kingsley Kent, S., *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640 – 1990* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 275
Image: Parliamentary recruiting committee, 'To the Women of Britain', accessed 25 September 2016, http://www.ww1propaganda.com/ww1-poster/women-britain-wont-you-help-and-send-man-join-army-day

The *General Annual Report on the British Armies* from October 1914 to September 1919, showed that from the period of the end of August 1914, when the White Feather campaign first started, to the start of October 1914, a grand total of 462,901 men signed up to the British Army; these figures represented a dramatic increase from the previous month when only 298,923 men signed up.[18] This clearly shows that the campaign was taking effect and that more and more men were taking it upon themselves to join the army and fight for their country. One example of such a man was Gunner Frederick Broome, he was accosted by three women on Putney Bridge who handed out white feathers to him, he states that he had "a good mind to chuck them into the Thames and eventually broke off conversation feeling very humiliated." This young man of only sixteen upon receiving these feathers walked across to the London Territorial Association of the Royal Field Artillery and went and signed up and was sent out to war soon after this encounter.[19]

As the war progressed, increasing numbers of men were being discharged from the British Army on medical grounds. This led to considerable trouble and controversy with regards to the White Feather movement. This was particularly predominant in 1915, as the first sets of injured soldiers were returning from the conflict zone. Upon seeing ex-soldiers in their civilian clothing, the white feather women started to hand out more and more white feathers. The problem occurred when they started handing out this emblem cowardice to the wrong type of people; people who had already fought for their country, suffered the injuries and had the psychological damage already done. There is a plethora of accounts of such events taking place, one such case being that of A.H. Wallace. He was a former soldier who was sat opposite a white feather woman on a bus, she then leaned over and handed him the feather and stated that he was a "coward". Feeling very shamed and taking great offence at this, he sharply replied, "excuse me, I'm not a bloody coward. If you [would] like to look at my leg you can find the other piece which is laying [sic] on the battlefield." This striking encounter exemplifies how even ex-servicemen were handed the white feather and were appalled, as they knew they had already done their part. In this incident, the white feather woman involved was heavily criticized by the other travellers on the bus with one man

[18] UK parliamentary papers, 1921, *General annual reports on the British Army for the period from 1st October, 1913, to 30th September, 1919,* cited in Hallifax, S. 'Citizens at War: the Experience of the Great War in Essex, 1914-1918 (Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 2010), p. 128.
[19] Arthur, M., *Forgotten voiced of the Great War* (London: Edbury Press, 2002)

going as far as to tell the ex-soldier to "hit the bitch".[20] This shows that the White Feather Campaign was quickly losing support, especially amongst the general public. Cases like the above occurred with a degree of frequency a further incident that supports this idea of the white feather women selecting the wrong people was the account of Mr Reuben Farrow, he like A.H. Wallace was medically discharged from the army after having one of his hands blown off in a battle in Flanders. Upon returning home and once dressed in his civilian clothing, he was approached by a woman who asked why he was not carrying out his duty for his king and country. Calmly he presented the stump of his arm where his hand once was; shocked and horrified the woman apologised before quickly departing in shame. This account goes further to back up the point that the white feather campaign was losing support and was not as effective as at the start of the war, thus showing it was no longer an effective recruiting weapon[21].

At this time, the campaign was also gaining a large degree of media attention regarding its downfall and degeneration. By the comparison various newspaper articles and accounts from the year 1915, covering the entire length of the country it is clear that there was very little support for the movement and most of the media from the time condemned the actions of these women. The *Aberdeen Daily Journal* from 3 June 1915 described the movement as an "insult to British Pluck".[22] This is highlighted to a greater extent in a paper from 31 July 1915, in which there was a coroner's account which stated that the White Feather women were "a pack of silly women-who knew nothing of circumstance".[23] This shows that the coroner holds the belief that the women were interfering individuals, who do not take into account any personal afflictions that were hindering the men's ability to go to war and by handing out the white feather to these men they were causing more harm than good- not only to the individual but also to themselves. The fact that Mr Kemp had his ideas published in a newspaper is testament to how strongly he objected to the actions of these women. It was not just civilians at home who were criticising the campaign publically in newspapers, many soldiers also wrote to the most popular newspapers; one soldier fighting in the Dardanelles thought that the White Feather Campaign was "a ridiculous way of recruiting men and that if men

[20] Ellsworth-Jones, *We will not fight*, p. 49
[21] Hart, 'The White Feather Campaign'
[22] Taylor, A., 'White Feather Methods Condemned', *The Aberdeen Daily Journal,* 3 June 1915.
[23] 'Silly Women and the "White Feather"', *Grantham Journal,* 31 July 1915.

required this much of insult then let them stay at home".[24] This shows that even men fighting away in the war saw the white feather as damaging and knew if men were forced into war then their hearts and nerve would not be in it and that it was a pointless escapade them being there, as they would soon lose their nerve and be medically discharged. This helps to demonstrate how far the campaign was now being publically criticised. *The Times* newspaper from 20 January 1915 went as far as to say "would not the feather-brained LADIES who delight in presenting white feathers to all and sundry (…) be better advised to LEARN to NURSE the WOUNDED and thus become useful, instead of offensive nuisances to society."[25] The abstract makes it clear that the person who wrote this had a strong dislike for the White Feather Campaign and the women involved. The use of the term "feather-brained" shows that the women involved had not ultimately advanced the cause of the women's movement. Instead of persisting with their efforts to humiliate men into serving, the article suggested that women should do something useful for the war effort and take up an occupation, such as nursing sick and wounded soldiers.

Someone who heeded this advice to enter nursing was Buxton-trained Vera Brittain. At the start of the war she was very patriotic; she had worried that the government would not be able to enlist enough men and so convinced her own brother Edward to go and do his duty.[26] Her views changed greatly after the loss of her fiancé, her brother and two of her friends; ultimately she became a convinced pacifist.[27] Throughout the war Brittain nursed both British and German injured men. Vera saw high death tolls on both sides and saw first-hand the horrors that war could cause, thus contributing to the shift in her ideology and her move towards pacifism. Brittain wrote of these horrors in her book *The Testament of Youth*, in which she noted:" to endure the fear and sorrow and fatigue that [the war] brought me, and to witness in impotent anguish the deaths, not only those who made my personal life, but of the many brave, uncomplaining men whom I had nursed and could not save". [28]

---

[24] 'White feather methods, condemned', *The Aberdeen Daily Journal,* 3 June 1915
[25] *The Times* 20 Jan 1915.
[26] Aitkin, J., *A War of Individuals, Bloomsbury attitudes to the Great War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 147.
[27] Ferguson, N., *The First World War A Miscellany* (Chichester: Summersdale Publishers Ltd, 2014) *P.19*
[28] Brittain, V., *Testament of Youth* (London: Virago, 1978), p. 471.

Brittain's increasingly pacifist views can also be seen in her writings about Armistice Day: "For the first time I realised, with all that full realization meant, how completely everything that had hitherto made up my life had vanished with Edward and Roland, with Victor and Geoffrey. The War was over; a new age was beginning; but the dead were dead and would never return".[29] She no longer saw the sending of men to war as glorious – for her it had become an utter tragedy.

On account of the innumerable problems that the white feather caused and as a consequence of all the negative publicity about the White Feather Women in 1916 the Government started to put into place measures to restrict such negativity. One of these measures was that of conscription. The Military Service Act was passed on 2 March 1916 and stated that all single men aged between 18 and 41 except for those medically exempt, clergymen, teachers and industrial workers had to sign up to fight for their country; going to war was now compulsory.[30] This process of conscription was seen as essential as it came at a time when the voluntary registration by men was not sufficient enough to produce enough new recruits to replace those lost at the front, in the February prior to the Military Service Act only 18,738 men chose to sign up, a massive decrease from the previous year where the number of men signing up was almost eight times as much. Gullance discusses how the Military Conscription Act was a success, as many men who would not have signed up previously were now obliged to do so; the end of voluntarism significantly altered the circumstances that had first encouraged the White Feather Campaign.[31]

However, there were men who opposed compulsory military service. Although conscientious objectors were relatively few in number, may be just 16,000, their presence was enough to allow for the sporadic continuation of the work of the white feather women. F. Goodall in *We Will Not go to War* describes how often ex-servicemen were mistaken for

[29] Brittain, *Testament of Youth*, p. 463
[30] UK Parliament, '1914-1960', accessed 6 April 2014, http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/private-lives/yourcountry/key-dates-/1914-1960/; UK Parliament, 'Conscription: the First WorldWar'; http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/private-lives/yourcountry/overview/conscription
[31] Gullance, 'White feathers and wounded men', p. 204

conscientious objectors by the white feather women. [32] This could be extremely embarrassing for the white feather women and highly insulting for the former soldiers. Therefore the Government, upon recognising that there was still an issue, put into place a measure that they were sure would halt the white feather women in their tracks; the Silver War Badge. The Silver Badge was implemented on the 19 September 1916 and was an attempt by the government and the home secretary to protect ex-servicemen from the actions of the White Feather distributors[33]. All ex-servicemen wore this badge and it was seen as an outward symbol to the public that the wearer's duty to his country had already been fulfilled.[34] Each badge had inscribed upon it, the words "for King and Empire, services rendered", further emphasising that these men had already served their country. Along with the silver badge each ex-serviceman was also issued with an official certificate of entitlement. This highlighted to a larger extent that the person in possession of the badge had actually served and that he should not be discriminated against.[35] With this measure put into place the White Feather could be rendered as useless and so it lost much of its backing and soon started to die out.

Once the Campaign had lost its support, the women who handed out the white feather started to distance themselves from its activities. After the War, many of the women chose to keep quiet about their war time antics. This can be shown by a campaign by the BBC in 1964; they tried to appeal to white feather women to step forward and speak to them. However throughout the entirety of Britain only one woman did, Mrs Mitchell. She admitted that she was not proud of her actions and described herself as a "chump".[36]

It is apparent that on the outbreak of war the white feather was an effective agent in gaining emancipation for women. In addition Ellsworth-Jones states that "the white feather was indeed a powerful, sometimes tragic and

---

[32] Goodall, F., *We will not go to war: Conscientious Objectors during the World Wars* (Stroud: The History Press, 2010), p. 1

[33] 'Badge to stop White feather', accessed 1 April 2014, http://www.theantifeminist.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/badge-1_1942.jpg

[34] 'About UK, Silver War Badge Records, 1914-1920', accessed 8 April 2014, http://search.ancestry.co.uk/search/db.aspx?dbid=2456

[35] 'Silver War Badge List 1914-1918', accessed 11 February, 2014, http://www.forces-war-records.co.uk/collections/info/86/silver-war-badge-list-1914-1918/

[36] Davis, C., 'I gave a Sailor a White Feather', *Daily Mirror,* 29 May 1964

occasionally laughable recruiting weapon."[37] However, as the War continued, the early potency of the White Feather diminished. On account of innumerable wrong accusations and hostile attention in the press, the campaign soon lost its support. By 1916, instead of being lauded as patriots, increasingly the women involved were teased, condemned and shamed into silence.

[37] Ellsworth-Jones, *We will not fight.* p.46

CHAPTER FIVE

LIFE IN RUHLEBEN CAMP: EDWARDIAN BRITAIN IN MICROCOSM

CHRISTOPHER BATTEN, JASON PICKERING, ELLIE WALSH AND NATHAN WILLCOX

The Prussian Ministry of War, the Deputy General Staff in Berlin and the Reich Office of the interior had a significant meeting on 17 October 1914; this meeting focused on the British civilians living in Germany and what action should be taken. Following the cases of abuse committed by the British towards German civilians, combined with claims of sabotage and fears of British spies being within Germany, the majority of those in the meeting supported the Deputy General Staff's proposal that all of the British males of military age within Germany should be interned.[1] The primary site chosen was Ruhleben, a racecourse just two miles west of the German capital. Upon their arrival, the internees were allocated unheated horse stables, with straw for a bed, which, as Peter Michaelson wrote, were "not fit for swines".[2]

Ironically, the English translation of 'Ruhleben' is 'a quiet life', and over the following four years the camp truly became an 'imagined community'. The inmates were a diverse mix of people from all social classes and from all corners of the British Empire. There were speakers of Arabic, Hebrew, Afrikaans, Welsh, Russian, Italian and even Yiddish. One-fifth of all inmates were reported to be German sympathisers with many having German families, although they sympathised with Germany they did not identify with her war aims.[3] 5,500 "Britons" were interned here between

[1] Stibbe, M., *British Civilian Internees in Germany: The Ruhleben Camp, 1914-1918* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2008), p. 1

[2] Cohen, I., *The Ruhleben Prison Camp: A Record Of Nineteen Months Imprisonment* (London: Methuen & Co. ltd, 1918), pp. 29, 30; Michelson, P, 'In Ruhleben Prison Camp', *The Century Magazine* (July 1917), p. 366

[3] Stibbe, *British Civilian Internees,* p. 2

November 1914 and November 1918.[4] Boredom and being excluded from the outside world became the main problems for internees, but within a short period of time Ruhleben had developed to become a 'captive community',[5] with a model society, and its own political hierarchy in the form of captains and deputies within the barracks.[6] There was also a rich cultural life in the form of football, theatre, casinos and other institutions, all of which strongly reflected the culture in Britain at the time, with an Edwardian style class society and colonial attitudes toward race. Life in Ruhleben became a version of Britain in microcosm.

In spite of all the societies and activities that were available to the people in the camp, they were still prisoners. The tedium of life in Ruhleben would begin at half past six every morning when the young men would be lined up in groups of four and paraded to the wash house, from there they would then be led to the post office.[7] Once there they would queue for the mail and parcels from home, which ranged from sugar to sardines, as well as the ever plentiful cocoa. One gentleman wrote to his mother in 1916 "thank you for the socks and jam, but please do not send anymore cocoa, if there is one thing we have in abundance, it is cocoa and we are growing ever tired of the stuff."[8] The *British Medical Journal* of 1916 stated that 'everything that goes to the life of the camp in the way of materials, has been sent out from this country or provided by the British government'.[9]

The camp was run by a group of military administrators composed of a commandant, named Count Schwerin, his deputy named Baron Von Taube, and staff consisting of soldiers and officers that took control of the everyday workings within the camp. By 16 September 1915, less than a year after it was established, much of the military control was reassigned to the outside of the camp, with the primary focus being to keep the

---

[4] Dowling, Timothy, *Personal Perspectives: World War 1* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO, Inc, 2006), p. 260; Stibbe, *British Civilian Internees,* p. 2.
[5] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, p. 60
[6] Ketchum, J.D*, A Prison Camp Society* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 273; Hoenselaars. T. 'The Company of Shakespeare in exile towards a reading of internment camp cultures' *Journal of the Spanish Association Of Anglo-American Studies* 33.2 (2011), p. 98
[7] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, p.190
[8] The Liddle Collection, Special Collections, The Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, LIDDLE/WW1/RUH/10, Thomas Cottrell-Dormer, March 1916
[9] Anon, 'British Prisoners at Ruhleben', *British Medical Journal,* 2, no. 2919 (1916), pp. 810-811

prisoners inside. It was on this day that the camp was said to have become "a bit of England; a small British colony as it were, planted in the heart of the enemy's country."[10] The camp was then led by the captains of barracks, who would refer back to the Commandant on a daily basis; the degree of autonomy granted to the prisoners is what truly set Ruhleben apart from other, conventional prison camps during the War. The lack of a regime, however, meant that boredom set in for many of the prisoners.

One way that many prisoners tackled this problem was through involving themselves in sports. Sport was for many a way to transport themselves from the feeling of captivity. One prisoner expressed how "one cannot consciously be a prisoner while also playing centre forward on a football team."[11] Sport for many prisoners was considered to be a metaphorical escape, a way for them to exhibit 'real world' nationalism within the enclosed world that was Ruhleben. Specifically, football emerged as a "collective obsession".[12] Within a week of arriving at Ruhleben, men requested footballs in letters home. One kindly sympathiser sent a ball, which led to the establishment of football teams such as "Manchester Rangers" and "Newcastle United".[13] There was a team in every barrack, which produced a real sense of barrack camaraderie. Despite a ban in the winter of 1914, the vast popularity of football led to the practice of organised sports from the 1 April 1915, when General Von Kessel approved the wishes of the camp populace and granted them 200 yards of the camp race course, where various sporting activities took place.[14] A football association was established in which representatives from each barrack would be called upon to arrange matches. Such arrangements reflected how dominant football had become in British pre-war culture.[15] One account captures the atmosphere of the second football season, which started in October 1915:

---

[10] 'Camp Administration: Introduction' *Ruhleben: A Digital Exhibit*, Harvard Law School Library; Historical & Special Collections, http://library.law.harvard.edu/digitalexhibits/ruhleben/exhibits/show/ruhleben/camp-admin Date Accessed: 13/02/2014

[11] 'Sports: Introduction', *Ruhleben: A Digital Exhibit*, Harvard Law School Library; Historical & Special Collections, http://library.law.harvard.edu/digitalexhibits/ruhleben/exhibits/show/ruhleben/sports Date Accessed: 13/02/2014

[12] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees,* p. 90

[13] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, p. 132

[14] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, p. 133

[15] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees*, p. 90

> There was something in the faces of the men, and the whole place that was reminiscent of an English bank holiday…with everybody looking quite satisfied with the world in themselves. The weather was ideal, the ground good, and the crowd big. What more could the footballing enthusiast ask for?[16]

A further aspect that contributed to the development of football within the camp was the presence of some famous footballing celebrities. This led to some international matches; former professional footballers, such as Fred Spiksley, Samuel Wolstenholme and Derby County's Steve Bloomer, played in an England Eleven against a World Eleven on 2 May 1915 which was captained by former Tottenham footballer John Cameron.[17] Football did create a sense of British society within the camp, however, it differed from Britain in one aspect: race. Football in Britain at this time was a predominantly white man's sport, but in Ruhleben, football transcended race and offered a social outlet for those who were otherwise segregated. Apart from competing in the barrack football and cricket league, black men were usually excluded from cultural activities. Sporting societies which varied in popularity such as cricket, football and boxing provided respite from the daily routine.[18] Boxing matches were displayed through pictures and were published outside the camp in various British and German newspapers, with *The London Daily Sketch* on 6 August 1915 carrying as its main headline 'even the German atmosphere cannot kill the old British sport of boxing'.[19] Fixtures and results were displayed in the *Ruhleben Camp Magazine* and these were very similar to the ones published in the British newspapers. Arguably, when it came to sport, Ruhleben was more of a utopian society than Britain was at the time.

The Ruhleben theatre opened in the spring of 1915, and just six months after the original internment of the British civilians, the first stage productions were mounted. In addition to a variety of shows and contemporary drama, such as the production of Cinderella, there was Shakespeare; the very first of the Shakespearian productions was *As You Like It*.[20] Shakespearian plays attracted a grand audience within the camp,

---

[16] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, p. 135; Mahoney, H.C., *Interned in Germany* (New York 1918), p. 135

[17] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, pp. 134, 187 & Mahoney, *Interned in Germany*, p. 198

[18] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, pp. 133-4

[19] Stibbe, *British Civilian Internees*, p. 91

[20] The Liddle Collection, LIDDLE/WW1/RUH/9, Charnley W.M. *In Ruhleben Camp,* Issue no. 7 September 12th 1915*;* Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp* p. 162

with the British being perceived as "not so indifferent to our great national poet as some people declare us to be".[21] In addition to conveying to the world the rural delights such as the horticultural society to be enjoyed in this internment camp, the production and the review of *As You Like It* enabled the authorities to show the world that Germany represented "a country of eminent cultural attainments" and that "Great Britain's enemy honoured Great Britain's poet despite the war".[22]

The coming of the theatre gave artists and ticket writers a glorious chance to devise striking and attractive posters which were displayed upon all eligible advertising spaces, however, they found that their markets somewhat limited until the camp magazine was launched. The *Ruhleben Camp Magazine* commenced its publication on June 1915; it was done with a typewriter, with copies continuously being developed with the acquisition of a duplicator and the printing being undertaken with supervised visits to Berlin. [23] The camp magazine successfully reflected the everyday life in the camp with Mahoney highlighting how it showed the "irrepressible Mark Tapleyism of the British race under distressing conditions".[24] Reading soon was a central activity for many in the camp. On November 14 1914, when the Ruhleben library first opened, there were a minuscule amount of books available to the prisoners, amounting only to 83. By the following year, this had increased dramatically to 2,000, with magazines from American and English sources being forwarded to Ruhleben. There were about 250 books taken out daily, and these books covered a range of topics from foreign languages, engineering, electricity and dictionaries which the prisoners constantly requested. The Ruhleben library provided classes with books and in the latter half of 1915, a British prisoner of war book scheme was set up where the public could send books to the camp.[25] This was the main source of escapism for the prisoners to take solace in. In 1916, Francis Gribble wrote that in the case of the scholars, their manifold interests in life made them largely

[21] The Liddle Collection, LIDDLE/WW1/RUH/9, Charnley, W.M. *In Ruhleben Camp,* Issue no. 7 September 12th 1915
[22] Foulkes, cited in Hoenselaars, 'The company of Shakespeare in exile', p. 98
[23] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees,* p. 80
[24] Mahoney, *Interned in Germany*, pp. 126-7.
[25] Koch, T.W., and Bostwick A.E., 'Books in camp, trench and hospital', *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 11.4 (1917) pp. 107-8

independent of their surroundings, and that Ruhleben became "almost a university town".[26]

Education in Ruhleben was seen as important as it was a way for the men to stave off boredom and keep their mind away from the conflict that they were missing out on. The camp school taught a variety of subjects, ranging from foreign languages, literature, music, bookbinding and sciences.[27] For those who knew modern languages such as German, Spanish and French and were willing to pass these skills on, teaching opportunities were advertised in the Ruhleben Camp magazine.[28] When they first tried to sell intellectual activities under the name of the Arts and Science Union, the camp authorities refused to grant their request due to a lack of accommodation. Henry Mahoney stated "we knew full well that the realisation of such a task in a concentration camp was no easy matter".[29] Israel Cohen went on to say that due to the vast popularity that the Arts and Science Union attracted, the camp authorities arranged that they could use the grand stand hall twice weekly.[30] Subjects like the history of musical development, soap manufacture and Chinese customs were some of the many subjects that the camp had to offer. A camp fund was set up to help the administration, in particular language studies worked on the basis of an exchange in languages, however the majority of those who wanted to learn these languages had very little to offer in return and therefore had to make the small financial contribution of three marks.[31] Some internees did find comfort in activities that lay outside the mainstream cultural life of camp, for example gardening, art and meditation.[32]

Societies and clubs were constantly being established. One issue of the 'In Ruhleben Camp' magazine wrote in 1915 "for the life of us we cannot see

---

[26] Gribble, F., 'Leaves from a Ruhleben Notebook', *Fortnightly Review* (Jan 1916), p. 67

[27] The Liddle Collection, LIDDLE/WW1/RUH/29 Lawson E.G., Prospectus of work for Summer term, 1917

[28] *In Ruhleben Camp Magazine,* Issue 3, Sunday July 11th 1915, p. 2; Kings College London, 'Image collection', accessed 1 April 2014, http://www.kingscollections.org/servingsoldier/collection/ruhleben-camp-magazine-no-3

[29] Mahoney, H.C., *Sixteen months in four German prisons: Wesel, Sennelager, Klingelputz, Ruhleben* (London and Edinburgh, S. Low, Marston & Co., ltd. 1917), p. 170

[30] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, pp. 147-8

[31] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, pp. 148-9

[32] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees,* p. 95

why the camp lacks a cabaret or Night Club, and surely no self-respecting Concentration camp should be without its Opium den".[33] There were shops in the camp which sold arts and crafts made by the prisoners, with shops emphasising British products like "Real English Toffee".[34] Despite such comforts, the most problematic aspect of Ruhleben, it seems, was that it was not possible to be alone. Many prisoners did not fit in at all, there were no fellow prisoners to truly bond with on matters that they had little interest in, with the 'Ruhleben By-election' resulting in a third of the prisoners making the conscience decision not to vote.[35] Those that decided to stay away from other prisoners were rightly believed to be suffering a mental breakdown; however, the cultural activities that were present in the camp seemed to form a sense of rough solidarity. The *British Medical Journal* in 1916 wrote that the 'University of Ruhleben' represents the intellectual and artistic culture of Britain.[36] As Ernest MacMillan, a Canadian inmate at Ruhleben stated, 'the Englishman must have his club'.[37] This desire for the club reflected English hierarchies. Socially, the Edwardian era was a period during which the British class system was very rigid. Economic and social changes created an environment in which there was more social mobility. Such changes included rising interest in socialism, attention to the plight of the poor and the status of women, including the issue of women's suffrage. This was reflected in the 'Ruhleben By-election' where Reuben Castang stood as the woman's suffrage candidate, although Israel Cohen claimed that Castang "soon made it clear that he was less concerned about the women's lack of votes than about the camp's lack of women"; Castang eventually won the by-election.[38]

Principally, the emotional turmoil caused by the act of internment was offset by the speed at which the imagined community grew.[39] During the early months of internment, differences in class appeared irrelevant with the prisoners being placed under the same conditions, however, exacerbated by conditions inside the camp, class distinctions of a peculiarly British nature

---

[33] The Liddle Collection, LIDDLE/WW1/RUH/9, Charnley W.M. *In Ruhleben Camp,* Issue no. 7 September 12th 1915*;*
[34] *In Ruhleben Camp Magazine,* Issue 3, Sunday July 11th 1915, p. 2.
[35] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees*, p. 95
[36] Anon, 'British Prisoners at Ruhleben', p. 811
[37] Schabas, E., *Sir Ernest MacMillan: The Importance of Being Canadian* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), p. 39
[38] Cohen, *The Ruhleben Prison Camp*, p. 144
[39] Ketchum, *A Prison Camp Society,* p. 37

soon came to force.[40] The class-community structure was unplanned and evolved rather naturally, but was unavoidably influenced by some outside forces.[41] For example, the more money a prisoner received from friends, relatives or charities at home in Britain, the more he had to spend on basic necessities or in the camp stores, thus making them more affluent and giving them a higher status in the camp. Frank Stockall claimed that 'with the coming of parcels came the school tie, the blazer [and] the club badge'.[42] Traditional Etonians and others competed with themselves to establish clubs that were exclusively to them, with them paying the other prisoners to serve drinks to them and wear white uniforms. [43] The basis of the class structure therefore stemmed from the economy within Ruhleben, which is notably similar to how class structures were perceived in Edwardian Britain.[44] Hot water was not free in Ruhleben – a payment was required.[45] Those who could not pay were eventually issued tickets, which allowed them to purchase hot water, thus creating richer and poorer camp classes.[46] Naturally therefore, the citizens of the camp soon fell into groups according to circumstances, temperament and social position. Although unordered and relatively chaotic in the beginning; the men were soon brought to heel under an efficient and rather authoritarian command, which took the guise of the Naval Captains who were also imprisoned at Ruhleben.[47] "Are the Captains going to take their fellow prisoners into their confidence or are they seeking to set up an absolutely autocratic regime?" was a question posed to Mr. Jones, the Ruhleben Camp treasurer, to which he could not reply.[48] Importantly, the fact that this question was asked at all, in an interview that all prisoners could read in the next edition of the magazine, highlights the complex nature of the peculiar social

[40] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees*, p. 95
[41] Ketchum, *A Prison Camp Society*, p. 104
[42] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees*, p. 95
[43] Cumming, Ed, 'Ruhleben: the WWI camp where gardening blossomed', *The Times Magazine*, accessed 20 February 2014, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/gardening/10606906/Ruhleben-the-WW1-camp-where-gardening-blossomed.html
[44] Maier, C., 'Recasting Bourgeois Europe' in Marwick, A., Emsley, C. and Simpson, W. (eds.) *War, Peace and Social Change in Twentieth Century Europe* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989); Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees*, p. 95
[45] *In Ruhleben Camp Magazine,* Issue 3, Sunday July 11 1915, p. 9
[46] *In Ruhleben Camp Magazine,* Issue 3, Sunday July 11 1915, p. 8
[47] Lawson E.G. RUH 29 Great War Memories of a German p-o-w camp, Capt. Rowland Humphreys; Ketchum, *A Prison Camp Society*, p. 275
[48] *In Ruhleben Camp Magazine,* Issue 3, Sunday July 11 1915, p. 5

hierarchy that was becoming apparent within the camp.[49] Bishop Bury stated that life at Ruhleben was not only tolerable but character building as an experience, the impression that remained with him was that the prisoners were "a body of intellectual, well set-up men, fairly representative of the best classes amongst us".[50]

There is evidence of colonial attitudes towards race inside the camp. The Black and Arab inhabitants within Barrack 13 and then Barrack 21 were largely isolated, with very little attention being taken towards the black British prisoners within the ranks of the white prisoners, only a few white prisoners went into barrack 13 and 21 from time to time.[51] Bishop Herbert Bury undertook a visit to this particular section of the camp in November 1916, and characterized the colonial attitudes at that time by saying:

> The negroes are in their own barrack, and have two of our best men in charge of them, who just simply love their work. It would never have done to put one of their own number in charge; but as it is they have just what the two races need – the white chivalrously helping the black, giving leadership and sympathy, and the black looking up to the white, confident of getting a really helpful and friendly lead.[52]

Alongside a belief in the 'natural' class system, a very real sense of British national identity and national pride emerged within the Ruhleben camp as well. This is perhaps best shown initially in the distinctly British names given to different parts of the camp by the prisoners. For example, the widest space in the camp was given the name of 'Trafalgar Square', and the camps largest gate was nicknamed the 'Marble Arch'.[53] An aristocratic club within the camp was even given the name of 'The House Of Lords', showing how the prisoners would try to emulate a distinct sense of British-ness and keep Britain alive within the walls of the camp.[54] As a result, the camp very much became seen as a little piece of England away from home, with one German remarking "You English seem to set to work as if you were founding a new colony". [55] It was even widely believed that the

---

[49] *In Ruhleben Camp Magazine,* Issue 3, Sunday July 11 1915, p. 5
[50] Anon, 'British Prisoners at Ruhleben', p. 811
[51] Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees,* p. 98-99
[52] Bury, *My Visit to Ruhleben* cited in Stibbe*, British Civilian Internees*, p. 99
[53] Ronayne, E., 'Cabbage soup again'- the hardships & resilience of men held in Germany's Ruhleben prison camp, *Centarynews*, 10 February 2014, http://www.centenarynews.com/article?id=1446
[54] Gribble, 'Leaves from a Ruhleben Notebook', p. 70
[55] Gribble, 'Leaves from a Ruhleben Notebook', p. 66.

weakest of the prisoners present within the camp were those who had the least 'English Blood' in their veins. The distinctiveness of the British identity that emerged can be seen as a reaction to the split in the internee's lives, between the world inside the camp walls, and the world outside the camp walls.[56] For example, German citizens were asked to knock a nail into a Hindenburg statue to represent their contribution to the war effort. Ex-prisoner E.G. Lawson stated in an interview that he saw a picture of his fellow prisoners pulling the nails out of the Hindenburg statue after being freed.[57] Interestingly, this was done without any protest from the Germans watching, and some of the prisoners even brought the nails home.[58]

Nonetheless life in Ruhleben was still the life of a prisoner; it is well documented that 'they', meaning the British, were "making the best of a bad job with energy of which England would be proud"[59] The lack of any concrete German involvement in the day-to-day running of the camp is argued to have contributed to the ability of the prisoners to maintain a British identity, as well as the growth of British national pride, as well as the class system. Within Ruhleben, the German guards and officials would only truly become involved if a prisoner would try to escape. The attempted escapee would receive severe punishment, and the carrying out of the prisoner's punishment gradually became one of the sole and core responsibilities of the German overseers in the camp. [60]

The many facets of life in the Ruhleben camp did truly constitute an imagined community, and did lead to a form of Britain in microcosm. The prisoners of the camp practised many of the same luxuries and experiences they would have otherwise experienced at home, despite being unable to leave. From the plethora of different societies and sports clubs freely available to the prisoners, to the extensive, fully functioning library and list of personal services available to them also, the culture and society of

---

[56] Ketchum, *A Prison Camp Society*, p. 192
[57] The Liddle Collection, LIDDLE/WW1/RUH/29 Lawson E.G., Interview by Mr. Liddle with E.G. Lawson in regards to his experience in Ruhleben, April 1978
[58] The Liddle Collection, LIDDLE/WW1/RUH/29 Lawson E.G., Interview by Mr. Liddle with E.G. Lawson in regards to his experience in Ruhleben, April 1978
[59] Gribble, 'Leaves from a Ruhleben Notebook', p. 70
[60] 'Camp Administration- Military Administration' *Ruhleben: A Digital Exhibit*, Harvard Law School Library; Historical & Special Collections, accessed 13 February 2014,
http://library.law.harvard.edu/digitalexhibits/ruhleben/exhibits/show/ruhleben/camp-admin

the camp was not far withdrawn from Britain's own. Coupled with the naturally developed class structure, the emergence of British national identity and the largely inactive role of the German overseers, Britain was able to appear in microcosm throughout the camp. In particular, it is the class system and the uptake of sports which best highlights the camps similarities to the Britain the prisoners left behind. With the Newcastle United Football team and a class system based on affluence the camp in those respects was indiscernibly true to Britain. It is only in the inherent nature of an internment camp, namely that the prisoners could not leave, in which the Ruhleben Camp did not resemble Britain in true microcosm.

CHAPTER SIX

TEDDIES, TOY SOLDIERS AND THE MILITARISATION OF PLAYTIME

LYDIA MCGRAW, HELEN WRIGHT AND JADE KELLY-SMITH

The Great War did not only shape and form the belief systems of the adult population within the United Kingdom but it also gave ample opportunities for the impact of militaristic influences on children too. These attitudes were not new, though, and the celebration of militarist masculinity amongst young boys was a feature from at least the late-nineteenth century. These values were encouraged by children having "boxes of soldiers in metal and wood... always a favourite toy with British boys".[1] The focus of this chapter is to examine how children were prepared for military service through games and toys. The chapter will consider how children's play helped to normalise war, promoting romantic images of battle and reinforcing distinct ideas of gender roles. The intention to romanticise and normalise combat led to an increased production of war-themed children's toys including soldiers, military vehicles and weapons. Children's toys and toy manufacturers created miniaturised replicas of battle sites, all of which were sold openly to children, particularly by the toy manufacturer William Britain of Britain's Limited.[2] By encouraging the sale of military based toys, a romantic, playful view of war was engendered and so Britain's children were conditioned to war through their playtime.[3]

---

[1] *Fancy Goods and Toy Trades Journal,* 6 July 1891

[2] Brown, K.D., *The British Toy Business: A History Since 1700* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996) pp. 65-67

[3] Sondhaus, L., *World War One: The Global Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 8

The concept of "childhood" is a social construct that has been subject to considerable change in the last millennium. The idea that children were completely different beings to adults, requiring different conditions to thrive became popular amongst elite families in Western Europe in the eighteenth century.[4] Adults saw children as the picture of innocence in need of protection and training, rather than it simply being assumed that children were able to take on the world, whether taught or not. John Locke's idea of the mind as a "blank slate" can be applied to this. After the seventeenth century, adults believed it was their duty to "write" upon this blank slate, shaping children rather than expecting them to shape themselves. In the late nineteenth century, childhood was perceived to be defined by innocence and fragility. Children were to be protected and needed to be taught the values and morals of life within society. At the start of the twentieth century, the morals and values of life were subject to significant change due to the Great War. With the introduction of the use of chemical weapons and other technological advances, Britain had to prepare for a war that would affect generations to come.[5] During the late-nineteenth century, youth organisations were created with the intention of preparing boys for military duties. Uniformed youth organisations particularly emphasised the need to inculcate the duty to be obedient and regimented and to be loyal to Crown and Country.[6] These organisations were preparing children for the Forces, encouraging key elements of militarisation with rewards, badges and military-style rank, slowly easing children into the concept of military service.[7]

The fact that playtime had become militarised for children was widely acknowledged; it was an accepted idea that young boys were being readied

---

[4] Ariés, P. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* (London: Vintage Books, 1965); Kociumbas, J. 'Childhood History as Ideology', *Labour History,* No.47 (November 1984) pp. 1-2; 7.

[5] Howard, Michael E., *The First World War: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

[6] Robb, George, *British Culture and the Great War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p. 174

[7] Porter, B., *Absent-Minded Imperialists: Empire, Society and Culture in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) pp. 115–23, 211; Springhall, J., 'Building character in the British boy: the attempt to extend Christian manliness to working-class adolescents, 1880-1914' in Mangan, J., and Walvin, J. (eds.), *Manliness and Morality: Middle-class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987) pp. 60–1; Thompson, A S., *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain From the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2005) pp. 120–21

for combat in their adulthood. The preparation of young children is shown through the advice of Sir William Wiseman who encouraged mothers to praise rather than scold children who fought with other children within their nursery. Play fighting at a young age was believed to have rendered the British superior in hand-to-hand combat.[8] As there was no certainty to how long the Great War would last, it was vital that soldiers who were killed or injured in combat could be replaced by new, prepared, combatants. This is significant in representing the ongoing and brewing conflict across the world, as the quote from Helmuth von Moltke demonstrates:

> Gentlemen, if the war which has hung over our heads for more than ten years like a sword of Damocles – if this war were to break out, no one could foresee how long it would last nor how it would end. The greatest powers in Europe, armed as never before, would confront each other in battle . . . Gentlemen, it could be a Seven Years' War; it could be a Thirty Years' War; and woe to the man who sets Europe ablaze, who first throws the match into the powder barrel![9]

The intense militarisation of children is particularly evident through exploring the material culture manufactured during the build-up to the Great War. Exploration of children's toys from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century shows the increase of military-themed toys. From the crimson-red soldier from Napoleonic battle to entire "modern" regiments of miniature lead figurines, their popularity created a fascination with militarisation in the minds of young children that was further encouraged by the adult world around them.[10] It was not only the soldiers that were popular as the weaponry and vehicles used at the Front were also embodied in toy form. The creation of a children's version of the Western Front allowed youngsters to familiarise themselves with warfare, making it a part of their every-day lives through use of playtime activities.[11] Celia Kingsbury emphasises the "insidious' role that war games and militarised organisations played in preparing children for war from an early age.[12] This slow "drip-feeding" of war-related materials into the lives of children

---

[8] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War*, p. 176

[9] Helmuth von Moltke, May 1890, cited in Simms, B., *Europe: The Struggle for Supremacy from 1453 to the Present* (London: Penguin, 2013), p. 192

[10] Brown, K. 'Modelling for war? Toy soldiers in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain' *Journal of Social History,* 24. 2 (1990), pp. 237-254

[11] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War*, p. 174

[12] Kingsbury, Celia, *For Home and Country: World War I Propaganda on the Home Front* (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), p. 169

allowed for war to become a natural concept within their lives, facilitating a natural progression from boy to soldier. This is particularly evident within the organisation of the Boy Scouts. The organisation sought to encourage "wholesome' values in boys and promoted positive attitudes towards the British Empire.[13] Playtime games like "scout signaller" and "trench", helped to develop a heroic image of the war. In the game "from the ranks to field marshal", players advanced around the board by securing promotion and honours for heroic acts in the game of battle.[14]

The acting out of heroic acts, though, was encouraged amongst some children more than others. As childhood experiences were often about preparing for adulthood, shaping boys and girls into men and women was usually a key focus of formal and informal education. Male gender ideals in the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries were heavily laden with ideas of militarisation. The impact of militarisation on boys within Britain during the early twentieth century showed the impact of romanticism surrounding war and combat. Militarisation was essentially a male concept during the build up to the Great War, as the male role within war was more accepted during this period, reflecting contemporary views surrounding gender. During the build-up to the conflict, the preparation of girls for war was minimal in comparison to the extent of the training for boys. Male values and social expectations were also reinforced through propaganda, which provided young, impressionable members of society with examples of the correct way to behave. Through the changes in toys during the period before the Great War, these links between children and militarisation are evident. Even though boys were made the main focus for the war efforts, girls were not ignored in the development of militarised Britain. Whereas boys were encouraged to partake in hand-to-hand combat to learn techniques that would be later used on the front line, an enhanced idealisation of stereotypical roles was also presented to young girls. Girls were readied for a future of womanhood that would include supporting their men, sensitivity and learning the skills to run their households and be the perfect housewives. Geoff Fox argues that the literature aimed towards girls had a powerfully conservative tone, encouraging both girls and women to support the war effort.[15] Fox further examines the role of the *Girl's Own Paper*, which appealed to an audience of an age range that was

[13] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War,* p. 174
[14] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War*, p. 176
[15] Fox, G., 'From the Great War to the Gulf: 1914-2000' in Agnew, K. and Fox, G. (eds.) *Children at War: From the Great War to the Gulf* (London: Continuum, 2001), p. 11

considerably broader than its male equivalent.[16] The paper gave advice to its readers in forms of quotations from influential female figures, for example the Duchess of Albany: "We must learn to be heroic, to be calm, and of good courage and to remain in the place where God has placed us, and to do our duty there".[17]

The patriotic language used within the Duchess of Albany's comment portrays the intention of the *Girl's Own Paper*, to put across to young girls that a woman's duty was to remain the rock of the household, maintaining order and decorum.[18] Other papers directed at girls, such as *Sunday Stories* and *Girls' Realm* gave away "silks" of patriotic subjects with instructions for embroidering them into cushion covers, showing that even though not aiding the creation of soldiers in young men, girls were still included in the British patriotic movement.[19] The movement for the militarisation of children showed a huge change for boys as they were being prepared for life at war, their toys were aimed to romanticise and normalise warfare. Although girls were encouraged to become more patriotic, their role to stay on the home front changed very little in comparison. George Robb argues that in times of war society allowed for a clear agenda; men were to enlist and fight for their country.[20] This was the only clear course of action. Wartime propaganda enforced the idea of traditional gender-specific principles. The militarisation of play allowed children to be integrated into the adult world, whilst still letting them act like children. Robb further emphasises the function of gender roles in wartime, highlighting that the war would rekindle the ideas of masculinity and femininity in the public. The promotion of idealistic and heroic portrayals of war was particularly prominent amongst children and adolescents, arguably as they were more receptive to outside influences. As Cunningham notes: "childhood was important, not in itself but for what it might tell you about the adult-to-be.'[21]

Objects from everyday life played a crucial role in shaping the transition from childhood to adulthood. As John Mackenzie highlights, toy soldiers

[16] Fox, 'From the Great War to the Gulf', p. 11
[17] Cadogan, M., Craig, P., *Women and Children First: The Fiction of Two World Wars* (London: Gollanz, 1978), p. 60
[18] Cadogan and Craig, *Women and Children First*, p. 60
[19] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War*, p. 175
[20] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War,* p. 32-3.
[21] Cunningham, H., 'Histories of Childhood', *The American Historical Review,* 103.4 (1998), pp. 1197-8

were "significant as recruiters for the armed forces".[22] With the establishment of British toy manufacturer William Britain, the strong German hold over toy production and selling within the British market was reduced by 50% before the outbreak of the Great War. By 1900, the company was producing over 100 different models of hollow metal toy soldiers; by 1910 an estimated 200,000 toy figures were leaving the factory in north London.[23] Brown further emphasises this boom in toy soldier production, arguing that by 1914 a minimum of ten million toy soldiers were being created for the British domestic market and being sold cheaply, averaging around one shilling.[24] As small boys were the biggest consumers of those toys, the subconscious influences of militarisation on children cannot be denied. The large-scale production and sale of toy soldiers contributed greatly to patriotism, but also helped to "normalise and trivialise" war for the general public.[25] Alongside toy soldiers, other patriotic paraphernalia was directed at the younger generation during the War. These included illustrated souvenir cards featuring regiments, war heroes, the latest weapons and battlefield scenes.[26]

The militarisation of playtime within the lives of young children before and during the Great War allowed for a continued readiness for potential armed conflict. Readying children for war was widely accepted and acknowledged by the British public, which shaped a militarised world for children to develop in, and led to the propagation of a romanticised vision of war. This in turn encouraged the idea that enlisting and fighting for their country was the natural thing for British boys to do as they grew into manhood. By contrast, girls were readied for a life on the home front in order to become good mothers, home makers and supportive wives to the future generation of soldiers. Toys, games, youth organisations and children's magazines were crucial weapons in helping to mould the next generation of combatants and conflict-ready citizens.

---

[22] Brown, 'Modelling for War?', p. 237; Mackenzie, J., *Propaganda and Empire: Manipulation of British Public Opinion*, 1880-1960 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. 28

[23] Brown, 'Modelling for War?', pp.. 238-239

[24] Brown, 'Modelling for War?', p. 239

[25] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War,* p. 174

[26] Robb, *British Culture and the Great War*, p. 175; 'The World of Playing Cards', accessed 1 May 2014, http://www.wopc.co.uk/belgium/brepols/ww1-commemorative.html.

CHAPTER SEVEN

BEYOND FRANZ FERDINAND AND BELGIUM: BRITAIN'S REAL WAR AIMS

ELLIOT CHAPMAN, CHARLIE BRADLEY,
LEIGH-ANN HARRIS AND BRADLEY WARREN

The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand is traditionally regarded as the trigger for the greatest conflict the world had thus far seen. It was this event in Sarajevo, combined with the obligation to protect the liberty of Belgium, which is often portrayed as the principal justification for the British Government's decision to declare war on Germany and the Central Powers. However, whilst Belgium provided the overt justification for Britain's entry into the War, it provided a cover for Britain's real concerns and lent a cloak of selfless justification to Britain's actions. As highlighted by Niall Ferguson, the centrality of Belgium in British government propaganda was designed to encourage the young men of the nation to respond to the call to arms and to represent Britain's participation in the Great War as a noble intervention on behalf of 'poor little Belgium'. [1] In reality the British government's war aims centred on the protection and ultimately the expansion of the British Empire. Britain was determined to maintain her position as the dominant world power and to counter any potential threats to this position.[2] This chapter examines British war aims at the beginning of the conflict and shows how they evolved in order to pursue the establishment of an ever wider British imperial presence. A brief examination of developments in the Middle East acts as a specific example of how the British exploited the War to serve their imperial ambitions. Finally, the chapter demonstrates how the British ensured that

[1] Ferguson, N., *The Pity of War* (London: Penguin Books, 1999), p. 161. See also, Bourne, J.M, *Britain and the Great War 1914-1918* (London: Edward Arnold, 1989), p. 7.
[2] Bourne, *Britain and the Great War,* p. 3.

the Treaty of Versailles secured the consolidation of British security and imperial power.

The British Government's objectives during the Great War were not purely ones of clichéd protection of liberty and self-determination, as is the established belief, but ones of imperial consolidation and expansion. Prior to the July Crisis there had been two decades of arms escalation on the European continent and as a result tensions between competing nations were high and often strained. This meant that complex alliances were being formed. The British had been complicit in this escalation of tensions, most notably through the naval race with Germany throughout the early twentieth century, where Germany sought to challenge the dominance of the Royal Navy in Europe. The British can be held partially responsible even further as they had completed the formation of the Triple Entente with France and Tsarist Russia, which added to the tensions with Germany and her principal ally, Austria-Hungary. Increasingly, these tensions fuelled an expectation of war, which led the Great Powers to be increasingly suspicious of their rivals. In short, as Paul Schroeder states, the July Crisis marked a culmination of a period where increasingly neurotic nations became entangled in alliances and treaties and became scared at the thought of losing power and prestige.[3] An example would be the aforementioned Austria-Hungary and Russia, who both felt threatened by each other and so any Austrian action would likely be countered by the Russian Empire under Tsar Nicholas in equal measure. In turn Austria would be supported by her great ally Germany and so it was clear Europe was primed for war well before the assassination of the Archduke. The Archduke's assassination might have proved yet another episode in the turbulent affairs of the Balkans, but as a focus for Great Power rivalry and suspicion, it ultimately proved the trigger for war. Had Franz Ferdinand not been assassinated, the Great War may well have broken out at some point in any case; such was the delicate nature of European politics at the

[3] Schroeder, P, 'World War I as Galloping Gertie: A Reply to Joachim Remak' in Koch, H (ed.), *The Origins of the First World War: Great Power Rivalry and German War Aims,* Second Edition (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1984), p. 103; Strachan, H., *The Outbreak of the First World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 25; Remak, J, '1914-The Third Balkan War: Origins Reconsidered', in Koch, H (ed.), *The Origins of the First World War: Great Power Rivalry and German War Aims,* Second Edition (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1984), p. 89.

time. Any trivial dispute or misunderstanding could have immediately escalated into something more threatening.[4]

It is worth noting that the British Government's interest in the July Crisis was limited, as the affair was regarded as a continental problem in which they wished to have no direct involvement. The Balkan region held little interest or value for the British and to say that it was the cause for Britain in particular entering the war would be misleading. Britain did not declare war in support of 'poor little Serbia'.[5] The British Government only declared war after the German invasion of Belgium, when the British nation itself was threatened with the possible outcome of Germany dominating the European mainland. The fear of a Germanic Europe had been growing in Britain as a consequence of the Anglo-German naval race, which in turn reflected wider fears about the increasing economic and political power of Germany. Seligmann observed that the Germans had never come close to matching let alone outgunning the Royal Navy. Despite this, the British public had been gripped by Germanophobia and such fears led to hostility from the British people towards Germany, her policies and her people.[6] The British government used the public's hatred of Germany to make entering the Great War a smoother process and to persuade the nation to continue the fight even though it came at great cost for Britain in terms of both lives and prosperity.[7]

From the outset, a common theme had emerged in British propaganda posters pertaining to the war. This theme was the cause of protecting Belgium from German tyranny, with nations such as Britain and France protecting small and defenceless Belgium from the evil Germans. However, this was little more than a veneer to motivate a public that became increasingly more discontented and sceptical, as the war progressed beyond its expected end in Christmas 1914. The protection of Belgium's liberty was not the reason that motivated Britain's government to enter the Great War. Sir Edward Grey, the foreign secretary, went on to admit in his memoirs that the real reason for British involvement was to

---

[4] Strachan, H., *The First World War: Volume I: To Arms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 48.
[5] Morrow, J.H., *The Great War: An Imperial History* (New York: Routledge, 2004), p. 35.
[6] Seligmann, M.S, 'Switching horses: the Admiralty's recognition of the threat of from Germany, 1900-1905', *International History Review,* 30.2 (2008), p. 242.
[7] Calder, K.J., *Britain and the Origins of the New Europe, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 15.

protect British interests in Europe, that the outcry against German tyranny in state propaganda was simply a tool to manipulate the public. Grey commented, "…..our attitude would be determined by public opinion, and the neutrality of Belgium would appeal very strongly to public opinion…."[8] The question of protecting Belgium also provided an issue around which the Liberal Cabinet, many of whom did not share Grey's outlook on foreign policy, could coalesce in support of the decision to take Britain into the War.

The Belgium issue hid Britain's real concerns. Sir Edward Grey believed that it was necessary for Britain to enter the War, in order to prevent Britain from becoming isolated in a Europe dominated by Germany. Grey stated: "We felt that to stand aside would mean the domination of Germany; the subordination of France and Russia; the isolation of Britain, and the hatred of her by those who had feared and those who had wished for her intervention".[9] It was feared a lack of British intervention would have had serious diplomatic consequences and would have allowed European nations to pursue an aggressive policy towards the British Empire. Zara Steiner shows in the decade leading up to the Great War that the British administration was fearful of German power. British cabinet members were fearful of what a German dominated Europe might mean for the British Empire.[10] Joachim Remak argues that the idea of a threat from Germany lacked credibility and that the belief in the German threat ultimately became a self-fulfilling prophecy. He argues very strongly that Britain's conduct leading up to the Great War was characterised by an aggressive and jingoistic mind set, motivated by a determination to dominate Europe and bend it to suit Britain's will. He shows that the British government had taken everything they wanted and then began to jealously guard their advantages.[11]

Maintaining the balance of power remained a priority throughout the War, as Britain fought to preserve a status quo that underpinned her imperial pre-eminence. However, as the War progressed, British views on how best to achieve this goal did evolve. At the end of 1916, David Lloyd George replaced Asquith as Prime Minister. Along with many in his cabinet, Lloyd George had been dismayed at the horrendous losses suffered by the

[8] Edward Grey quoted in Joll, J., *The Origins of the First World War,* Second Edition (Harlow: Longman Group, 1992), p. 26.
[9] Edward Grey quoted in Martell, *The Origins,* p. 103.
[10] Steiner, Z., *Britain and the Origins of the First World War (*London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1977), p. 83.
[11] Remak, '1914-The Third Balkan War', p. 90.

British at the Somme, with casualties reaching approximately 400,000. Their dissatisfaction was increased further in 1917, when the Passchendaele campaign produced 300,000 casualties without significant advantage.[12] Pessimism increasingly characterised British Government views on the prospects of a military breakthrough on the Western Front. The scale of the British Army's losses prompted fierce debate between the British government and General Haig over the best use of manpower. Lloyd George and his cabinet took a very dim and melancholic view of the situation in Europe and were convinced that the Western Front was ready to fall to the Germans. If this turned out to be the case then the security of the British homeland itself would be severely threatened; what was feared in 1914 would indeed have come to pass, and the Germans would have total dominance over Europe and the northern coastline.[13] Adding to the pessimism was the withdrawal of Russia from the War, following the Bolshevik seizure of power.

There was little that Lloyd George and his government could do to solve what appeared to be a very disastrous situation. The Germans would very likely dominate the European continent in the near future, meaning that the continued level of support to the French on all sections of the Western Front was futile, as the Allies would be unable to prevent the French and Dutch coastlines from falling into German hands. With the balance of power likely to shift even further towards the Central Powers, Lloyd George and his government decided to counter this by ensuring the maintenance of Britain's global power. They aimed to achieve this by shifting from a Eurocentric posture into a more global imperialistic strategy, most notably in the Middle and Far East. The faction within the government that supported Lloyd George and this imperialist strategy were known as the New Easterners. They immediately created a Sub-Committee on Territorial Changes which was instructed to look at territorial demands of the warring nations outside of the European continent. Wartime policy was altered to reduce the growing pressure on the Home Front by demanding that colonies shoulder more of the burden

[12] Kennedy, P., *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (London: Fontana Press, 1989), p. 345.
[13] Constantine, S., *Lloyd George* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 54; Millman, B., 'Counsel of despair: British strategy and war aims 1917-1918', *Journal of Contemporary History,* 36.2 (2001), pp. 245-246.

in Europe. Due to this policy colonial soldiers began to make a far larger contribution to the effort on the Western Front.[14]

The British hoped to maintain and expand power in the Middle East for themselves and wait for support on the Western Front from the United States. The US government was more likely to enter the conflict after the German authorisation for their navy to use unrestricted submarine warfare against civilian shipping in 1916. David Stevenson notes that the Middle East also held the attraction of greater trade and wealth for the British. Particular attention focussed on the security of the Suez Canal. The Canal was crucial not just to trade but also to the ability of the British to reinforce and protect their oriental empire from attack, as fears abounded over British control of the Indian Ocean if the Germans launched an invasion from their colonies in East Africa.[15]

It must be noted that whilst the German nation was the greatest threat to British balance of power, it did not mean that the British government were not wary of Russia and France, their allies in the Entente. As Goldstein highlights, in 1917 the Imperial War Cabinet instructed the Dominions in the Pacific to expand their territories across the Pacific Asian peninsula in order to prevent the French from imposing their own power on the area and to match the growing influence of the Japanese. This imperialist approach to prevent any other nation from obtaining too much power was also the reason why the Imperial War Cabinet was advised by Lord Curzon to redraft the earlier Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916 regarding the Middle East. Curzon interpreted the treaty as granting far too much territory to the French at the expense of British imperial power. The British war aim of maintaining the balance of power applied to all nations, and from 1916 it is clear that the British had to expand and preserve their influence in the Middle East, in order to counter the seemingly imminent German victory in Europe.[16] As David Stevenson points out, the approach that the British took to the Middle East in 1916 was pursued with the aim of preserving British imperial power for the long term future. The British

[14] Goldstein, E., *Winning the Peace: British Diplomatic Strategy, Peace Planning, and the Paris Peace Conference 1916-1920 (*Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 14; Millman, B, 'Counsel of Despair', pp. 253, 259; Stevenson, D, *The First World War as Political Tragedy* (Cambridge: Perseus Books Group, 2004), p. 265.
[15] Millman, 'Counsel of Despair', p. 248; Stevenson, *The First World War,* pp. 117-18.
[16] Goldstein, *Winning the Peace,* pp. 16-17.

government acted to diminish the imperial power of their wartime allies as well as their wartime enemies.[17]

The British turned their attention to the East even as the Germans themselves were close to collapse on their own Home Front. The dramatic reversal of fortunes for Germany, after the failure of the March 1918 offensive, meant British expectations in 1917 about the inevitability of a German-dominated Europe proved unduly pessimistic. The defeat of Germany and the ensuing peace negotiations provided Britain with the opportunity to secure its position in Europe and to enhance its imperial powerbase.

The Treaty of Versailles was the post war agreement that pertained to the punishment of Germany and aimed to settle issues such as the payment of reparations. The British were represented at Versailles by Lord Summer and Walter Cunliffe, who have become known collectively as the 'heavenly twins'. They were responsible for presenting the British case for reparations in 1919. John Maynard Keynes had been tasked with giving the ‘heavenly twins’ a target for reparations and he ultimately came up with three billion pounds, but he asserted that two billion would be plenty. Unfortunately, the majority of Liberal MPs who supported the Keynesian view on reparations were voted out at the 1918 election and Lloyd George was forced to adopt a more hard-line approach. Keynes left Versailles, saying the heavenly twins were gloating over the devastation of Europe. Ultimately the British demand for reparations was closer to twenty four billion pounds.[18] Thompson argues that the British objective at Versailles in fiscal terms was designed to ensure Germany was weakened. This was to ensure that Germany ceased to be a threat and to restore the balance of power within Europe, which was so important for the security of the British nation, and one of the principal reasons for going to war in the first place. Nevertheless, Paul Kennedy argues that David Lloyd George still took a much more lenient stance on peace terms than the French did, as he saw Germany as a potentially valuable partner against any future Bolshevik threat.[19]

---

[17] Stevenson, *The First World War,* p. 259.

[18] Lentin, A., *Guilt at Versailles: Lloyd George and the Pre History of Appeasement* (London: Routledge, 1985), pp. 55-58.

[19] Kennedy, P., ‘Idealists and realists: British views of Germany 1864-1939’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 25 (1975), pp. 150-1; Thompson, D, *Europe since Napoleon* (London: Penguin Books, 1970), p. 605.

The British government continued towards their goal of maintaining the balance of power when they supported the principles outlined by Woodrow Wilson for European citizens to have the right to self-determination. The British saw this ideal as yet another opportunity to ensure one nation did not rise to threaten the balance of power in Europe, as the continent would be divided into as many countries as possible. The Polish Corridor was established in order to weaken Germany by splitting the nation geographically and new East European states were established with the objective of checking both German and Bolshevik power.[20]

It is apparent that the British government only supported self-determination when it was in their interest to do so. Whilst the nationalities of Europe were allowed to write their own destiny, within reason, the Middle East was carved up into different pieces, with each victorious nation vying for territory. As mentioned earlier, the British government had been advised to reform the Sykes-Picot Treaty of 1916, in order to gain more prestige and territory over the French. The collapse of the Ottoman Empire gave the British the perfect opportunity to establish mandates and secure control of the Suez Canal, in order to increase trade and gain yet more resources for the British Empire. The British came out of the First World War with their empire at its largest expanse, covering twenty five per cent of the globe. Consolidating and expanding British imperial power was a clear aim at the start of the war and the peace settlement had provided the clear affirmation of it.[21]

Evidently, in terms of British war aims, the claim to be defending the liberties of small nations, such as Belgium and Serbia, was only a cover for Britain's real motives for entering the War. Britain's primary concerns were security in Europe, through the preservation of a balance of power, and the preservation of its global position. These are perhaps uncomfortable facts from the standpoint of 2016, as Britain seeks to look back on the War as one fought in the cause of freedom and democracy.[22] The ideology of the New Easterners proves that the British Government's war aims were entirely imperialistic and selfish in nature. Their influence resulted in Britain dominating the Middle East, establishing mandates over Palestine,

[20] Millman, 'Counsel of Despair', p. 264.
[21] Black, J., *The Great War and the Making of the Modern World* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011), p. 267; Kennedy, 'Idealists and Realists', p. 150.
[22] Calder, *Britain and the Origins of the New Europe,* p. 15.

Transjordan and Iraq.[23] In short, Britain's war aims concentrated upon the maintenance of Britain as the preeminent world power. During the course of the War, the British saw opportunities for further imperial expansion and the peace making had secured these gains. As John Morrow writes, "Statesmen viewed colonial and continental issues as inextricably intertwined, the two merging indistinctly, and in the British official mind, with the imperial often of greater import".[24]

[23] Owen, R., *State, Power and Politics in the Making of the Modern Middle East,* Second Edition (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 9.
[24] Morrow, *The Great War,* p. 35.

CHAPTER EIGHT

TROUBLE IN PARADISE: THE WEST INDIES AT WAR

JORDEN CRAWFORD, ALEXANDRA KEMPSON, FERN PITHERS AND LEWIS WALE

A soldier of the West Indian regiment who fought during the Great War said: "We are treated neither as Christians nor British Citizens but as West Indian niggers, without anybody to be interested in or look after us".[1] Despite an outward appearance of unity, there were many internal racial divisions within the British Empire at the start of the twentieth century, and this spread onto the battlefield. Discrimination was rife among the ruling elite who were in charge of the war effort and segregation was witnessed throughout all areas of the British Military. This chapter explores the racial prejudice faced by members of the imperial forces, in particular those from the West Indies. Furthermore, attention is given to the exploitation of the West Indies population and their economy by the British Government. In addition to this, the ideas surrounding how involvement in the First World War saw a rise in nationalism in the region, as well as being a source great pride for those who fought for both their country and Empire, is discussed. The impact of the Great War was felt far beyond the European battlefields, and it caused real Trouble in Paradise.

Life in the West Indian colonies was shaped by the impact of many years of colonial rule. The people of the West Indies endured segregation, which David Cannadine identifies as a reflection of a British class system. He argues that the British view of society was reflected in how they administered their rule throughout the Empire. The people of the West Indies were collectively viewed as inferior, as they were likened to the

[1] Quoted in Johnson, H. 'The British Caribbean from demobilization to constitutional colonization' in Louis, W.R and Brown, J.M. (eds.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol.4, The Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999), p. 599.

"undeserving poor" of Britain.[2] Despite this "the loyalty displayed by West Indian colonist in 1914 was the result of intersecting ideologies of empire and race which had long been internalised".[3] The British felt that they knew more about the West Indies than the local population knew about themselves, and so believed they had the right to exploit their population and commodities of their colonial possessions.[4] This was apparent in many aspects of life in the colony, and the British Military were a prime example of those who chose to exploit the West Indian populace for the sake of victory.

The West Indies regiment was not established immediately following the outbreak of war. However, a combination of losses on the front line, a general shortage of man power and the demand for inclusion from the West Indies natives led to the regiment being properly utilised from 1915. Between 1914 and 1917, 15,294 men from ten of the West Indian colonies contributed to the war effort.[5] The inclusion of West Indian troops had been adopted begrudgingly by the British High Command, many of whom were not welcoming of the new personnel. Since the Boer War the capabilities of the Black troops deployed on the front were seen as a threat to the white man's pride. It was feared that black troops sent to the front were capable of outperforming their white counterparts. Lord Kitchener agreed with this idea and in private his beliefs reflected the majority opinion when he stated that "black soldiers should never be allowed at the front alongside white soldiers". [6] However he did not express this publicly due to the potential uproar it could cause. Instead he was reported to have said publicly "with the black race, I can whip the world", reflecting the idea that black soldiers had a place in the conflict, albeit a subservient one.[7] Unsurprisingly, when the West Indian Regiment were sent to the Western Front they experienced significant discrimination and faced segregation due to their race. This prejudice meant that regiments like the West Indian Battalion were more likely to do manual labour rather than

---

[2] Cannadine, D., *Ornamentalism: How the British saw their Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 6
[3] Johnson, 'The British Caribbean', p. 597.
[4] Said, E., *Orientalism* (London : Penguin 1995)
[5] Table b 4, contribution of men to BWIR from each colony, source: Report of the West Indian Contingent Committee, September 30th 1917 (primary) cited in Howe, D.G., 'West Indians and World War One: a social history of the British west indies regiment' (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of London, 1994), p. 355
[6] Rogers, S., 'There were no parades for us', *The Guardian* November 2002.
[7] Rogers, 'There were no parades for us'.

fighting alongside white soldiers.[8] They were also paid less. Under the Army Order No.1 of 1918, the British soldier received one shilling, six pence a day, a gain of six pence over the previous wage.[9] The War Office however ruled that the West Indians could not get the additional pay because they were Natives. Actions such as these created strained relations between West Indian soldiers and the British Army elite.

This continued once they reached the front line where many white military men believed them to be lacking self-discipline and incapable of understanding the tactics of the modern battlefield.[10] There was a perception amongst white forces that it was dangerous to arm large groups of black men. This was because they believed that racism was functionally necessary to the stability of imperial rule.[11] Shaped by ideas which dated back to the period of trans-Atlantic slavery the black race was seen as uncivilised and needed to be controlled. Therefore when it came to war and fighting the war effort was segregated based on the colour of a man's skin rather than on their bravery and capabilities. Furthermore they were largely prevented from holding commissions for the army; the council opposed officers being appointed "who are not of unmixed European blood".[12] Despite constant and obvious racism throughout all stages of the war process the soldiers of the West Indies were still loyal to their mother country of Great Britain. They believed that the empire provided them with a tradition of monarchy which, despite calls for independence, was still at the forefront of many West Indian soldiers' minds.[13]

It was considered that "The civilised Negro is vain and imitative, he is not impelled to enlist by a high sense of duty in the trenches, he is not likely to make a good fighter……in the firing line there is no place for a black battalion".[14] Discriminative attitudes circulated throughout the British

[8] Rogers, 'There were no parades for us'.
[9] Elkins F.W, 'A Source of black nationalism in the Caribbean: the revolt of the British West Indies regiment at Taranto Italy', *Science & Society*, 34.1 (1970), p. 99.
[10] Smith, R., *Jamaican Volunteers in the First World War, Race masculinity and the development of national consciousness* (Manchester : Manchester University Press 2004), p. 61.
[11] Levine, P., 'Battle colors: race, sex, and colonial soldiery in World War I'. *Journal of Women's History* 9:4 (1998), pp. 104-30.
[12] Joseph, C., cited in Johnson, 'The British Caribbean', p. p. 599.
[13] Smith, *Jamaican Volunteers,* p. 61.
[14] Howe, 'West Indians and World War One', p. 108.

military. During the recruitment phase, West Indian volunteers were presented as "childlike, a form of entertainment, ineffective and endearing".[15] They were consciously rejected on the grounds of minute medical defects. For example, in Guiana by 1917 approximately 71% of potential recruits were rejected on health grounds that were not applied to prospective British soldiers, who were subjected to relaxed selection criteria. However, racial discrimination was soon side lined by the pressing need for recruits and by the end of 1916 any man of good health was allowed to enlist across the Empire.[16]

Recruits were not the only required commodity by this point. Due to the high cost of the war, the exploitation of economic resources became more and more necessary. The West Indies played an important role in the contribution of economic assets to the British war effort. From the outbreak of the First World War, despite the fact that, at first, men from the West Indies were refused, all British West Indian colonies were required to make financial contributions to the war effort. They were expected to contribute to the initial expenses incurred by the British Government for recruitment and logistics. When the soldiers were eventually accepted, a financial contribution exceeding six pounds per man was expected for every soldier sent. As the war progressed the British Government introduced policies to ensure that contributions to the war effort from West Indian colonies continued. For example Jamaica, despite the hurricane of August 1915 was still expected to make financial contributions. It could not accept the full liability for its expected war contributions; it was required to make annual payments of £60,000 for forty years following the end of the war to repay its war debts.[17]

Jamaica was not the only West Indian colony overwhelmed by these war debts. Barbados was required to pay £33,000 per annum, Trinidad £12,000 and British Honduras (excluding Antigua and St Kitts) £10,000.[18] These contributions financially crippled the West Indian economies and hyperinflation occurred as a result. For instance the Colonial Office calculated that between 1914 and 1919 prices in Trinidad had risen by 145%, a rate of inflation much higher than in Britain itself.[19] For the sake

[15] Smith, *Jamaican Volunteers,* p. 61.
[16] Howe, 'West Indians and World War One', p. 120.
[17] Smith, *Jamaican Volunteers* p. 61.
[18] Joseph, C., cited in Howe, 'West Indians and World War One', p. 352.
[19] Brereton, B., *A History Of Modern Trinidad 1783-1962* (Kingston, Jamaica: Heinemann, 1981)

of victory the British Government felt the need to exploit its colonies despite their weakened economies. As a result the West Indies saw a great rise in poverty and further regression in living and working conditions, something many people did not expect as a result of contributing to the war effort.[20] The populations of the West Indies saw the outbreak of the Great War as a positive opportunity, a chance for them to prove themselves to their motherland; however, as Bridget Brereton and Kevin A. Yelvington have noted, the result was "carnage".[21]

The resources extracted from the West Indies were numerous and ranged from vehicles to raw materials. The British government took advantage of the natural resources of the colonies and exploited them to full affect for the sake of victory. Gifts to the value of several thousand pounds were contributed to the war effort. However not all these contributions were monetary; they included sugar, rum, oil, lime, cotton, rice, clothing, wood, airplanes and ambulances.[22] In addition to this, in spite of the severe hardships caused by the drastic rise in the cost of living, charitable donations of approximately two million pounds were collected.[23] Not all of the population supported these donations, with many contesting them at a local level. These reservations were highlighted by liberal newspapers such as *The Grenada* which published articles discussing the reservations expressed by locals about what they regarded as unnecessary extravagance on the part of the local governments.[24] Most people believed that the local government should have concentrated on lessening the hardships experienced by the local populations. Many adopted the position that the war was not their responsibility, that it was a "white man's war" and that they should not be expected to be involved. Thus, for the rest of the war, the local governments had to fight a battle of portraying an equal level of commitment to the war effort and the problems at home to placate the demands of the local populous in order to avoid discontent.

---

[20] Samaroo, B. 'Non-traditional sources for the study of the Trinidad disturbances of the 1930s', in Brereton, B and Yelvington, K.A. (eds.) *The colonial Caribbean in transition: essays on post emancipation social and cultural history* (Kingston, Jamaica: Press University of the West Indies; Gainesville: University Press of Florida 1999), p. 226.

[21] Samaroo, 'Non-traditional sources', p. 236.

[22] Howe, D.G., 'A white man's war? World War One and the West Indies', BBC History website, accessed 1 March 2014, http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/wwone/west_indies_01.shtml

[23] Howe, 'A white man's war?'.

[24] Howe, 'A white man's war?'.

Despite the best efforts of the local government, the growing discontent within the colonies provided a catalyst for the development of nationalism within the West Indies. Herbert de Lisser believed that the war would provide an invigorating antidote directed most specifically towards the black peasantry and working class of the West Indies.[25] With the outbreak of the war the relationship between the crown and the people of the West Indies was strong. As war progressed this relationship came under scrutiny from the West Indian population after the mistreatment soldiers suffered. These actions by the British Military influenced the rise of Black Nationalism throughout the West Indies. As the second half of the First World War progressed, discrimination was rife and segregation was more apparent than ever. The pay of West Indies soldiers became a matter of dispute, and as tensions grew it became a leading factor for the Taranto mutiny of 1918, where soldiers attacked their superiors and others refused to work in a bid to vent their frustration.[26] This mutiny helped to create a sense of unity amongst the West Indies Regiment as well as influencing the rise of nationalism back home.

As the realities of the war became more apparent soldiers became more politicised which led to an increase in their self-awareness and sense of identity. Evidence indicates that the British Colonial power was becoming increasingly aware of a rise in nationalism across the West Indies. A secret colonial memo of 1919 indicates these concerns and stated "nothing we can do will alter the fact that the black man has begun to think".[27] Marcus Garvey, a key voice in the Black Nationalist movement at the time, vocalised a new social and racial consciousness in the weekly *Negro World*.[28] He wrote that "the black skin is not a badge of shame but rather a glorious symbol of national greatness",[29] reflecting his growing commitment to widespread nationalism. Furthermore, linking back to Cannadine's ideas regarding Ornamentalism, the British attempts to replicate their hierarchal social system became their downfall as nationalism began to rise. The so called lower classes began to take pride in their ethnic identity and attached themselves to their own land rather than the British.[30] This led to

[25] Smith, *Jamaican Volunteers*, p. 33.
[26] Rogers, 'There were no parades for us'.
[27] Rogers, 'There were no parades for us'.
[28] Elkins F.W, 'Suppression of the "Negro World" in the British West Indies', *Science & Society*, 35.3 (1971) pp. 344-347.
[29] Garvey, M., *Selected Writing and Speeches of Marcus Garvey* (Dover Publications Inc., 2005), p. 103.
[30] Cannadine, *Ornamentalism'*.

the British West Indies Regiment creating the Caribbean league which expressed aspirations and the need for self-determination.[31]

As a result of continued discrimination and poor treatment throughout the war, soldiers returning to the West Indies received little recognition for their contributions to the British war effort. Even though they had contributed at an equal level to their white counterparts, their services were rewarded with exclusion from the army pension scheme. Their services were very rarely recognised and only in a few cases were black solders rewarded for their gallantry. Only 81 medals for bravery were awarded and a mere 41 men were mentioned in despatches. The level of disenchantment rose significantly and with limited resources and lack of recognition, the people of the West Indies wanted self-governance without any British involvement. However, despite this, they did want to continue to be associated with the British Monarch. This was particularly the case in Jamaica where the people expressed no sense of attachment to the empire after the war but instead attached themselves to the Monarch.[32] Loyalty to the crown did not mean loyalty to the empire, and this increasingly became the collective view throughout the West Indies.[33] The rise of nationalism came about as the result of negative experiences during the war. The local population of the West Indies developed their national identity, and so sought a greater independence from their colonial rulers.

The collective effects of nationalism, racism, economics and military prejudice gave rise to trouble in paradise. The First World War had a significant effect on nationalistic desire that encouraged and influenced independence movements. The British fuelled the nationalist fire with the exploitation of both manpower and economic commodities. By doing this, and by not recognising that the West Indians contributed so much to the war, the British government undermined their own authority and pushed the Empire towards fragmentation. In the eyes of the West Indians, nationalism grew as a result of necessity not out of desire. They saw no alternative but to defy colonial rule. The actions of the British government and military forces destroyed the trust the West Indians had in their rulers. The experience of many West Indian soldiers that served in the British Army during the First World War did not reflect the desired sense of equality so actively sought by the black population. The treatment of West

[31] Elkins, 'A Source of Black Nationalism in the Caribbean', p. 102.
[32] Smith, *Jamaican Volunteers*, p. 39.
[33] Knight, F., *The Caribbean: The Genesis of a fragmented Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 205.

Indian soldiers was notably different to the treatment received by their white counterparts. Racial prejudice outweighed the dire need for manpower and even with the high price of war the British were still reluctant to fully utilise their West Indian troops due to unsubstantiated perceptions of black inferiority.[34] At the start of the War the West Indian colonies saw the conflict as a chance to consolidate their connection to the British Empire by committing themselves fully to the war effort. [35] However, despite the fact that the sheer quantity of resources, troops and support came very close to crippling the West Indies, little gratitude was shown for their contributions. It is clear that the destabilisation of the West Indies was a result of the discontent caused by the British exploitation of their empire.

[34] Johnson, 'The British Caribbean', p. 599.
[35] Johnson, 'The British Caribbean', p. 597.

CHAPTER NINE

AUSTRALIA: A NATION MADE IN WAR? DEFIANCE, DISAPPOINTMENT AND DETERMINATION

ADAM AL-SAFI, SHELBY SQUIRE AND SOPHIE PHILIPS

One of the more profound challenges facing historians today is how to understand and interpret what motivates populations to form their national identity. This is especially acute when examining the self-governing colonies of the British Empire, particularly Australia. A number of historians argue that the First World War was seen as a catalysing force of national awakening, with the landing at Gallipoli in April 1915 viewed as a major turning point in the formation of an independent Australian nation.[1] Historians such as C. E. W. Bean saw the 25 April 1915 as the day when Australia founded its national history and achieved an "independent place of honour among the free nations of the world".[2] With the centenary of the First World War celebrated in 2014 many Australians have continued to believe the ANZAC myth; as historian Peter Stanley notes, the Gallipoli campaign: "occupies a central place in Australia's national mythology, identity and memory. The landing on the Peninsula has been portrayed by commentators across the political spectrum as representing the place and time when Australia became a nation."[3]

---

[1] Ludewig, A. 'For King or Kaiser? Competing loyalties among Australian civilian internees in Ruhleben during World War I.' *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 98.2 (2012), p. 249

[2] Williams, J.F., *ANZACS, the Media and the Great War* (Australia: University of New South Wales Press Ltd., 1999), p. 19/20.

[3] Gare, D. and Ritter, D., *Making Australian History: Perspectives on the Past Since 1788* (Melbourne: Thomson, 2008), p. 311.

Tony Abbott, as Prime Minister, stated "ANZAC Day is the most sacred in our national life".[4] This highlights the profound importance and significance with which modern Australians have come to view the ANZAC sacrifice; many believe it to be the singular event which pulled together the Australian population to form its national identity. Gallipoli is "part of our national consciousness, it's part of our national psyche, it's part of our national identity" stated Kevin Rudd boldly, in November 2008, "and I for one, as Prime Minister of this country, am absolutely proud of it".[5] When critically analysed, the ANZAC legend risks facing accusations of inaccuracy, but it remains embedded in modern Australian society. Australia's collective memory is anchored in the fantasy of Gallipoli and the Western Front, especially the narrative about how the British brazenly sacrificed heroic Australian soldiers at Gallipoli "in order to divert the enemy from where the British were disembarking in one of Winston Churchill's many military follies, and in doing so, revealed to the world the brave and plucky Australian soldier" worthy of their own nation.[6]

There was little doubt in the August of 1914 that the majority of Australians would support the imperial war effort. Formally, it seemed that the Australian Federation had little choice in its decision to enter the war. With the 1901 constitution, a degree of autonomy had been granted to the colony, however the reality of this was very different. Australia was not an independent nation state and so Australian politicians had no control over its external relations as London managed foreign policy on behalf of the entire empire.[7] As W. J. Hudson and Martin Philip Sharp note: "The colonies were at war when their sovereign, advised exclusively by United Kingdom ministers, was at war, and they were at peace when their sovereign, advised by United Kingdom ministers, was at peace".[8] However,

---

[4] Liberal Party of Australia, 'Tony Abbott Press Release - ANZAC Day 2013', accessed 20 March 2014, http://www.liberal.org.au/latest-news/2013/04/25/tony-abbott-press-release-anzac-day-2013.

[5] Damousi, J. 'Why do we get so emotional about ANZAC?', in Lake, M. and Reynolds, H., *What's Wrong with ANZAC? The Militarisation of Australian History* (Australia: University of South Wales Press Ltd, 2010), p. 94.

[6] Hoffenberg, P.H. 'Landscape, Memory and the Australian War Experience, 1915-18' *Journal of Contemporary History,* 36: 1 (2001), p. 114.

[7] Reynolds, H. 'Are nations really made in war?', in Lake, M. and Reynolds, H., *What's Wrong With ANZAC? The Militarisation of Australian History.* p. 27.; McDermott, P. 'External affairs and treaties: the founding fathers' perspective', *University of Queensland Law Journal* 16: 1 (1990), p. 126

[8] Hudson, W. J. and Sharp, M. P., *Australian Independence: Colony to Reluctant Kingdom* (Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1998), p. 15.

while they had to become part of the war effort, Australia was afforded a level of discretion over the size of their commitment. Andrew Fischer, the Australian Prime Minister in 1914, pledged the country's support for the war, promising "our last man, our last shilling".[9] There was little public questioning of the need for Australians to support Great Britain.[10] As William Irvine, the Irish-born Liberal attorney-general, described: "When England is at war we are at war. There is no half-way home".[11] Prior to the war there was a significant sense of loyalty to Britain, as well as a fear for security in the Pacific. Much of Australia's loyalty was anchored within cultural and emotional identification with the United Kingdom. Over half a million Australians in a population made up of 4.3 million had been born in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales.[12] Sir Henry Parkes, in 1890, stated that "the crimson thread of kinship runs through us all".[13] Both of these factors could be used and taken advantage of by the patriotic press and the leaders of opinion in 1914. Therefore, when a warning cable was sent to the Australian government by Britain on 29 July,[14] the small cabinet agreed to not only place the vessels of the Royal Australian Navy under the control of the British Royal Navy, but to also offer London an expeditionary force of 20,000 men.[15]

However, it is important to remember that the Australian Federation found it difficult to fill the ranks of the first expeditionary force.[16] As E. M. Andrews puts it: "Historians who make much of the "rush to enlist" might

---

[9] Macintyre, S., *A Concise History of Australia,* Third Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 157

[10] Beaumont, J., '"Unitedly we have fought": imperial loyalty and the Australian war effort', *International Affairs,* 90.2 (2014), p. 398

[11] Meaney, N.K., *Australia and world crisis 1914-1923* (Australia: Sydney University Press, 2009), p. 8.

[12] Knibbs, G.H, *Census of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1911, part II, Birthplaces* accessed 27 March 2014, http://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/ausstats/free.nsf/0/0354DDBB061331F2CA2578390011E1AF/$File/1911%20Census%20-%20Volume%20II%20-%20Part%20II%20Birthplaces.pdf

[13] Sir Henry Parkes at the Australasian Federation Conference, Melbourne, in 1890

[14] Andrews, E.M., *The ANZAC Illusion: Anglo-Australian Relations during World War I* (Australia: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 40.

[15] Beaumont, '"Unitedly we have fought"', p. 399.

[16] Williams, J.F., *ANZACS, the Media and the Great War* (Australia: University of South Wales Ltd, 1999), p. 101

do better to ask why 93.3 per cent of eligibles did not enlist".[17] For those who voluntarily enlisted, it was not necessarily just a desire to serve the mother country. A number of mixed motivations could be given including a sense of adventure, the desire to travel and economic hardship. While British-born volunteers may have jumped on the chance to visit the heart of the Empire, which many saw as their ancestral "home", an argument could be made that those enlisting did so not out of patriotic desire to the British Empire, but out of pragmatism. At this time, unemployment was rife in Australia by late 1914 as a result of severe disruption to Australian trade and the loss of enemy markets. The pay in the Australian Imperial Force (AIF) was good; therefore it was seen as a stable career opportunity in the midst of economic hardship.[18]

Differences between Australian and British soldiers soon became apparent during the Great War. Many British soldiers found the Australians' behaviour and attitude to be refreshing and appreciated the lack of "side, swank or class distinctions".[19] The lack of formality provided comfort for British soldiers, and gave them a small reminder of home. Despite this, however, many British officers saw the Australian soldiers' attitude as disrespectful; there was no saluting and the manner in which they spoke to an officer was out of the ordinary.[20] One soldier stated that: "Their conventions and way of speaking to officers, etc., would send some of our old soldiers crazy. It is Tom, Dick and Harry all the way round with them".[21] Looking at these differences from the Australian perspective, however, showed that much resentment formed as a result of perceived incompetence on behalf of the British generals, with Thomson arguing that "the stubborn commitment of the British High Command to a war of attrition, and British generals' mismanagement of most major battles, were sources of bitterness and derision".[22] Much of this resentment stemmed from the Battle of Gallipoli. During the First World War, Britain planned to strategically knock the Ottoman Empire out of the war, landing at

[17] Robson, L.L., *The First A.I.F.: A Study of its Recruitment* (Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1970), p. 14
[18] Mokyr, J., *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Economic History: Volume I* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 179.
[19] Emden, R. V., *The Soldier's War: The Great War Through Veteran's Eyes* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2009), p. 323
[20] Emden, *The Soldier's War,* p. 323
[21] Emden, *The Soldier's War,* p. 323
[22] Thomson, A., *ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 40

Gallipoli on the 25 April 1915 using Australian, British and French forces. This plan was enforced to give the Triple Entente advancement against the Triple Alliance by combining the Balkan states as allies to drive forces against Austria- Hungary. The momentum behind this was to gain easier access to Russia to supply its southern ports with food stuffs, ammunition and military equipment so that the troops could defend the Eastern Front from the aggressive German attack.[23] Even though there was immense pressure on achieving a victory at Gallipoli the planning that went into the strategy of battle was led by incompetent British commanders who did not factor in Turkey's strong military defence and the geographical terrain of the battle field at Gallipoli. This in turn led to a major military failure and eight thousand Australian soldiers were killed. It was widely believed amongst the surviving antipodean soldiers that the Australian Imperial Force was exploited by the British, and that they were sacrificed, they believed, in order to save the lives of the British forces. Despite this, there was a recognition of the importance of the Empire to Australians for their economic security and stability. This is clearly demonstrated by leaflets that were distributed in Australia and New Zealand depicting naval ships surrounded by the British flag that were deployed to help defeat Germany at sea in the English Channel and also helped distribute food stuffs to soldiers on the front.

Although these links to Empire were revived, the First World War, particularly the Gallipoli invasion, provided the impetus of nationhood. It was the first major battle Australia had been involved in; the events at Gallipoli militarized their history from 1915, showing a sense of pride for the courage that their young men had shown dying for not only Australia but for the British Empire. As the official war historian C. E. W. Bean wrote, the Great War helped serve as a test of Australia's national character, with the sacrifice of the Australian Imperial Force being seen as passing that test triumphantly. Despite the failure at Gallipoli, for the Australians its triumph lay in:

> …the mettle of the men themselves. To be the sort of man who would give way when his mates were trusting to his firmness … to live the rest of his life haunted by the knowledge that he had set his hand to a soldier's task and had lacked the grit to carry it through – that was the prospect which

[23] Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia*, p. 93

> these men could not face. Life was very dear, but life was not worth living unless they could be true to their idea of Australian manhood.[24]

Adrian Caesar argues that during 1914 and 1939, male Australians were obsessed with their gender identity. They used the ANZACs to militarise their history, and aspired to be heroic like the soldiers.[25] However, this ideal was not necessarily one the soldiers themselves could meet. One Australian study argues that the "diggers", who bottled up fears so that they could live up to the ANZAC reputation of bravery and self-control, were especially prone to nervous collapse.[26] Furthermore, as Thomson notes, one former soldier remembered that some men would "go to any lengths to get out of the army and off the peninsula". The same soldier said that there was "one man who pestered him for days for his arm to be broken and others who rammed picks into their legs while they were tunnelling underneath no-man's land".[27] Despite this, some writers have dismissed such evidence and suggest that the ANZAC legend represents the values, behaviour and qualities of Australian society as a whole: "qualities of bravery, perseverance, mate ship, determination and all the other positive aspects that can be found in the story".[28]

This idealization of Australian male identity continued to develop during the Second World War. Written in 1942 Charles Bean's *ANZAC Book* was the most effective wartime rendering of the ANZAC legend. In the book he fabricated a heroic figure for the young boys of Australia to aspire to, who was brave, strong and determined. Boys and men for many generations would follow this nationalistic view in a desperate attempt to be distinguished as a separate nation. D.A. Kent has argued that Charles Bean's *ANZAC Book* was an accurate perception of the legend which sees the ANZAC being portrayed as a tough, brave, heroic man, much like bush men, even though the majority of the ANZACs were from cities and towns.[29] While Bean was heavily focused on the idea of masculinity and racial improvement of the "Anglo-Saxon man", his positive account of

---

[24] Cited in Lake, M., 'What have you done for your country?', in Lake, M, & Reynolds, H., *What's Wrong with ANZAC? The Militarism of Australian History* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd, 2010), p. 2.
[25] Bendle, M, 'The Assault on ANZAC: The Legend and the Left', *Quadrant* 53:7-8 (2009), p. 12
[26] Thomson, *ANZAC Memories,* p. 38
[27] Thomson, *ANZAC Memories,* p. 39
[28] MacLeod, J., *Reconsidering Gallipoli* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 6
[29] MacLeod, *Reconsidering Gallipoli,* p. 6

Australian military manhood was also affirming for soldiers who wanted to feel that their manhood had been sustained, that their actions had been valued, and that their efforts were worthwhile.[30] This was the case for Percy Bird, a member of the 5th Battalion. Like many Australians he felt that the ANZAC legend could be seen in his own personal experiences. Percy's account was that of English and French officers treated the diggers with less respect yet, despite this discrimination, the officers were surprised and admired at how well drilled and physically fit the Australians were. Percy remembered French women cheering "we're safe now, the Australians are here!'[31] Personal experiences like Percy's along with the emphasis on masculinity by Bean began to create a sense of Australian national pride.

The experiences of Australia during the Second World War were important in both the development of the ANZAC myth and a growth in national identity. On the outbreak of the Second World War, Australia was willing to fight for the British cause once more. Winston Churchill told Dominion leaders in late 1939 that the defence of Singapore, Australia and New Zealand ranked only after the defeat of the Germans in Europe.[32] However it was not until 1941, when Japan entered the Pacific war, that there was a profound sense of fear and threat of invasion within Australia. The events at Pearl Harbour in 1941 and the humiliating fall of Singapore to Japanese forces in 1942 left Australia in a state of panic as Britain had seemingly lost their economic and military superiority in the Far East.[33] As Beaumont states: "Australians had long known that their own security and economic prosperity were dependent on the global supremacy of Britain".[34] The fact that the British only sent two warships to Singapore in 1941 further highlighted to Australia that they could not rely on the British for protection any longer. Australia, in a sense of isolation felt that it needed to control its own defence, and the feeling of an independent nation developed. As Stanley states: "not until after the stress of another wartime crisis - after Greece, Crete and Singapore - would Australian's faith in Britain falter and develop into a self-reliant pride in a nation

[30] Thomson, *ANZAC Memories,* p. 64
[31] Thomson, *ANZAC Memories,* pp. 79-80
[32] McIntyre, D. D, 'The Strategic Significance of Singapore, 1917-1942. The Naval Base and the Commonwealth', *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, 10:1 (1969), p. 85
[33] Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia,* p. 191
[34]Beaumont, '"Unitedly we have fought"', p. 400

independent of Britain".[35] Gallipoli was the spark of nationalistic ideology, but it was not until after the Second World War that the full force of the ANZAC myth was developed.

Furthermore, many historians, especially during the 1970s and 1980s, have suggested that Gallipoli, and in particular the ANZAC legend, has "little relevance to women, to a multicultural Australia, and to an era when a military heritage was tarnished by widespread anti-Vietnam war feeling".[36] The Vietnam War led to a heightened sense of nationalism which stemmed from the young population of Australia resisting involvement in wars concerned with the Empire. This is particularly understandable, especially when America suddenly withdrew its troops from Vietnam leaving Australian politicians without a clear plan.[37] The Vietnam War and the Second World War demonstrated to the Australian public the uncertainties of fighting in wars which Australia could gain little from. The Australian government felt the need to separate their own security demands away from Britain moving towards the sense of an independent nation. From the 1980s onwards the view held by the Australian public to draw away from the Empire is a more plausible notion than the ANZAC legend extended from Gallipoli, which is the typical celebrated view in contemporary commemorations of the First World War.

Many Australians feel a powerful connection to the founding story of Australian nationalism; the ANZAC legend is seen as commemorating the past deeds and "sacrifice" of ex-servicemen, and is a strong tie for many to the cultural characteristics of its nation's people. The overwhelming majority of Australians are emotionally attached to what they perceive to be a well-established reverential tradition, one that sees Gallipoli as a positive force in helping to establish an Australian nation. To question the significance of the ANZACs and of Gallipoli in Australia today would likely result in upset and derision; it is argued that the "…cultural primacy of the ANZAC myth is neither traitorous nor disrespectful of the dead".[38]

---

[35] Stanley, P., 'Australia in World War One' BBC History Website, accessed 28 January 2014, http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwars/wwone/australia_01.shtml.

[36] Robert Lewis, 'The Australian Homefront during World War 1 '. Anzac Day website, accessed 21 April 2014, http://www.anzacday.org.au/history/ww1/homefront/homefront.html

[37] Dijkink, G. *National Identity and Geopolitical Visions: Maps of Pride and Pain* (Routledge, 1996), p. 90

[38] The Age, 'Creation of a nation?' (23 April 2009) accessed 2 May 2014, http://blogs.theage.com.au/yoursay/archives/2009/04/creation_of_a_n.html

Charles Bean's work in the *ANZAC Book* helped to establish a national narrative of the ANZAC; the reality of this account, however, was far from accurate. If anything, the First World War can be said to have increased loyalty to the Crown and Empire. As Reynolds notes: "the bond with king and empire had been sealed and sanctified in blood".[39] As has been keenly demonstrated, other key militarised events, such as the Second World War and the Vietnam War were responsible for enhancing Australia's need for their own security. This would mean gaining control over their own national activities separate from the interference from Britain. It is important to state, however, that whilst Australia wanted the creation of an independent Australian nation, it did not want to distance itself too far from Britain and its Empire. In 2014, the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge visited Australia on a royal engagement. This reflects the ongoing relationship between the two nations and shows a shared faith in the Commonwealth. Whilst on the Tour, the royal couple took part in the ANZAC day commemorations, which resulted in a 17 per cent decline in support for an Australian republic, reflecting the shared desire for a close relationship between Britain and Australia, which still remains today. [40]

[39] Reynolds, 'Are nations really made in war?', p. 27.
[40] The Sydney Morning Herald, 'Popular royals tip republic off radar (16 April 2014), accessed 1 May 2014, http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/popular-royals-tip-republic-off-radar-20140415-36pvh.html.

CHAPTER TEN

REQUIEM: FOULDS, BEAVERBROOK AND A "BRITISH" FESTIVAL OF REMEMBRANCE

ANTHONY BUTTERWORTH, THOMAS DEBAERE, LAURA JACKSON AND RICKESH PATEL

John Foulds' *A World Requiem* was a piece written in the spirit of pacifism and internationalism. However, it was an ethos that did not sit well alongside those with conflicting visions for commemoration. Although the music and mode of remembrance introduced by Foulds through his *Requiem* and Festival of Remembrance resonated well among the public, its use was short lived. This was largely due to the efforts of those who were in a position to dictate culture. The anti-Foulds campaign by the *Daily Express* and its reinvention of the Festival after 1927 was motivated by the strong isolationist and pro-empire tendencies of its proprietor, Max Aitken, the first Baron Beaverbrook.[1] After the *Daily Express* took over organisation of the Festival of Remembrance the rhetoric and imagery changed from international grief and mourning to a nationalist and pro-empire celebration of the war effort. Beaverbrook and the *Express* were not alone in their agenda; the BBC was similarly supportive of imperial interests as reflected in their ideas regarding suitable forms of remembrance.[2] *The Times* newspaper on the other hand was one of the few press outlets to show any support for Foulds and the

[1] Taylor, A.J.P., *Beaverbrook* (Hamish Hamilton, 1972), p. 491; Mansell, J., 'Musical Modernity and contested commemoration at the Festival of Remembrance, 1923-1927', *The Historical Journal,* 52:2 (2009), p. 452

[2] van der Linden, B., *Music and Empire in Britain and India. Identity, Internationalism and Cross-Cultural Communication* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 91; Richards, J., *Imperialism and Music. Britain 1876-1953* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 162; Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 447

World Requiem.[3] This clash between modes of remembrance, or "contested commemoration" as it has been termed by James Mansell, is symbolic of the wider struggle in the 1920s between traditional and modern expressions.[4] The attempted cleansing of Germanic influences from cultural tastes, as documented by Glenn Watkins, represented a struggle between empires that was reignited after the war and found voice in the search for a "British" Festival of Remembrance.[5] A study of the work of Foulds and the public reaction helps to give a new insight into the debate between Paul Fussell and Jay Winter regarding the impact of the war on cultural modernity.[6] The fact that Foulds' *Requiem* resonated with those in attendance seems to contradict Winter's assertion that modernity was unconcerned with grief.[7] Despite this positive response, Foulds' vision for the event was erased in a conscious effort that points towards a growing external dictation of the nature of commemoration. Historians James Mansell, Jeffrey Richards and Bob van der Linden have explored the campaign by the *Daily Express* to shape the Festival of Remembrance and their analyses are well supported by a study of the primary sources available in the *Daily Express* archive.[8] Trudi Tate and Kate Kennedy have very recently produced pioneering work on music and the Great War and a case study of Foulds and the environment in which his work was simultaneously accepted and rejected is relevant to their theories.[9] This chapter argues that the battle between Foulds and the *Daily Express* was more than a matter of taste; it signified a deliberate attempt to impress upon the British public ideas about country and empire in the interwar period that were palatable to those in positions of cultural power.

In order to explore the shifts in the nature of commemoration, it is necessary to assess the content and imagery of Foulds' original Festival and compare these elements to that which emerged under the influence of

---

[3] Richards, *Imperialism and Music*, p. 159
[4] Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 433
[5] Watkins, G., *Proof Through the Night: Music and the Great War* (London: University of California Press, 2002), p. 47
[6] Fussell, P., *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 35; Winter, J., *Sites of Mourning, Sites of Memory. The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 227
[7] Winter, *Sites of Mourning,* p. 227
[8] Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 434; Richards, *Imperialism and Music,* p. 160; van der Linden, *Music and Empire in Britain,* p. 89
[9] Kennedy, K. and Tate, T., 'Literature and music of the First World War', *First World War Studies,* 2:1 (2011), p. 3

the *Daily Express*. Foulds aimed to create a "cenotaph in sound" where the listener would find themselves within a tomb created by the waves of sound from the orchestra.[10] He was also strongly driven by his belief in Theosophy which influenced his desire for internationalism and allowed space for his love of Indian music to express itself. The Festival symbolised Foulds' ideals, of a "tribute to the memory of the dead", but perhaps more importantly to honour the "bereavement of all countries".[11] Kennedy has identified that Foulds' music offered the opportunity for a collective act of remembrance.[12] The words used in *A World Requiem*, chosen from multiple sources by Foulds' wife Maud McCarthy, further reflect this internationalism. The references to the *Pilgrim's Progress* represent a British and Christian element; however the inclusion of work from Kabir, a poet of Hindi origin, highlights the trans-religious spirit of the Festival between 1923 and 1926.[13] It was this ethos of internationalism that both characterised Foulds' outlook and was simultaneously unpalatable to those who eventually sought to change the event. Because the music was international and ambiguous in its outlook, Foulds' festival lacked any overt nationalism. The print culture associated with the festival also included imagery that could be appropriated by a number of nationalities and so was a canvas upon which one could project grief, mourning and belief of any kind. This inclusivity was not limited to crossing the boundaries of nationality or religion; the festival also memorialised non-combatants.[14]

After 1927, though, the nature of the Festival was almost unrecognisable when compared to Foulds' vision. The music involved was strongly traditional, largely British and made up of a mixture of compositions, hymns and songs from the war. Germanic influences were purged with a strong focus on British composers such as Elgar.[15] Mansell has argued that the *Daily Express* wanted music that was "compatible with national pride and the necessity of war".[16] This is shown in a programme of the Festival, which was included in the November 11th issue of the *Daily Express* in

[10] Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 435
[11] Richards, *Imperialism and Music,* p. 159
[12] Kennedy, K., '"A music of grief": classical music and the First World War', *International Affairs,* 90:2 (2014), p. 386
[13] Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 434
[14] Kennedy, 'A music of grief', p. 386
[15] Watkins, *Proof Through the Night,* p. 42
[16] Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 450

1927, and in many subsequent years.[17] Where *A World Requiem* had promoted pious reflection and grief the *Daily Express* marketed their festival as a celebration of the Armistice and victory. The inclusion of soldiers' songs from the war, in which the audience were encouraged to participate, was an extension of a wider *Daily Express* policy of encouraging community singing.[18] This policy aimed to bolster community spirit in the interwar period. With the addition of a "British" Festival of Remembrance as its centrepiece it can be seen as an attempt to anglicise leisure and culture. This was in very direct conflict with the internationalism seen in Foulds' event. Foulds had preferred a religiously ambiguous stance whereas the *Daily Express* opted for Christianity. The programmes for the *Express* Festivals are littered with Christian rhetoric, time for prayer and hymns. The festival ended with the Lord's Prayer and the words "God save the King" and the audience went on their way having been blessed by the bishop.[19] At other points the choice of music was designed to instil a sense of nostalgia about the war years and to celebrate the effort of not only Britain but the colonies. The imagery and print culture surrounding the Festival was a similar departure from the years under Foulds, with the blank canvas being replaced by distinctly British colours and icons.[20] The gulf between the ethos and content of the festivals under the control of two very different organisations is immediately clear and runs deeper than a surface evaluation. International grief was replaced by a celebration of victory and empire.

The cumulative effect of Foulds' open and accommodating festival was one of intense public support and the original festival ran to sell-out crowds at the Royal Albert Hall between 1923 and 1926. Although *A World Requiem* was not received positively by the *Daily Express* and much of the wider press, as van der Linden has noted, the public were greatly appreciative of this modernist composition.[21] Similarly the music was endorsed by The British Music Society; Foulds' composition was strikingly modern and different from more traditional and "British" music in both musicality and inspiration. [22] Foulds' biographer Malcolm McDonald has reported that the concerts were a huge success with

[17] 'Armistice Day Celebrations', *The Daily Express*, 11 November 1927, p. 1
[18] 'Community Singing', *The Daily Express*, 13 November 1926, p. 1
[19] 'Armistice Day Celebrations', p. 1
[20] 'Pageant Of Genius At Albert Hall', *The Daily Express*, 12 November 1928, p. 2
[21] van der Linden, *Music and Empire in Britain*, p. 89
[22] Adams, B., *Edward Elgar and his World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), p. 362

audience members in tears and that Foulds received a ten minute standing ovation. This example of popular cultural modernity in the interwar setting allows for an alternative view on the relationship between the Great War and expressions of grief and remembrance than is more often confined to the study of literature and rhetoric. The strong link between music and remembrance validates the importance of considering events such as these when exploring the commemoration of the First World War. There is debate in this area between Fussell and Winter and the impact of applying Foulds' work to this discourse has been assessed by Mansell.[23] The positive response from the public and the composition's place within the framework of grief would seem to contradict Winter's argument that modernity was of no use to people wanting to mourn and come to terms with the trauma of war.[24] However, it does support Fussell's theory that the Great War ushered in modern cultural expressions.[25] The conclusion proffered appears to be that there was a more complex set of responses and needs than a binary choice between modern and traditional.

In approaching the public response to the new *Daily Express* Festival of Remembrance it is important to note that there was almost universal appreciation shown towards both incarnations. This is in itself a useful realisation in revisiting the historical debate between Fussell and Winter. The continued popularity, despite the vastly changed nature of the festival, shows again that a more nuanced approach is needed than a binary choice between modern and traditional. The public reaction to Foulds' *Requiem* and his Festival of Remembrance vindicated its introduction and shows that the piece created an atmosphere in which the public could grieve. This did not concern Beaverbrook and the *Daily Express*, though, as they sought to impress upon the public a celebration of victory and pro-empire attitudes.

The public reaction was not reflected within particular sections of the press. The attitude of those in control of these institutions was in direct conflict with the public appreciation and resulted in a deliberate change in direction of the Festival. This can be seen most clearly in the words and actions of Beaverbrook and the *Daily Express* who Foulds' biographer Macdonald has described as an abusive and implacable foe.[26] Prior to 1926

[23] Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, p. 35; Winter, *Sites of Mourning,* p. 227; Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 434
[24] Winter, *Sites of Mourning,* p. 227
[25] Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, p. 35
[26] Macdonald, M., *Music To-Day,* cited in Richards, *Imperialism and Music*, p. 160

the *Daily Express*' attitude towards the Festival was one of either ambivalence or scorn. Whilst it can be dangerous to generalise the mind-set of an organisation made up of so many individual journalists, what is known about the way Beaverbrook ran his newspapers allows a degree of space for such statements. Beaverbrook's strong opinions and close control over editorial decisions meant that, with the notable exception of David Low, the paper was most often a mouthpiece for its proprietor.[27] During the years of Foulds' Festival of Remembrance coverage of the event in the pages of the *Daily Express* was notable in its absence. Armistice Day received heavy coverage from leader articles, starting on the front page, yet these reports were dominated by the ceremony at the Cenotaph and the sale of poppies.[28] Foulds' alternative and international "cenotaph in sound" was but a brief footnote at the bottom of extensive reporting on more distinctly "British" remembrance activities.[29] The position of the *Daily Express* swung between this ambivalence and outright criticism. After the first public performance of *A World Requiem* in 1923 the review from the *Daily Express* branded the music "facile, glib and workmanlike".[30] Further to this they attributed any positive effects of the music to the public's predisposition and suggestiveness.[31] The review concluded that despite the failings of Foulds to do the occasion justice the event did show the need for a yearly concert that would play host to nothing but "the sublimest thoughts of indisputable genius", a challenge that was taken up by the *Daily Express* in 1927 when they provided what they described as a "pageant" to just this effect.[32]

Much like the ethos and content of the Festival, the coverage in the *Daily Express* took an about turn when the festival changed hands. Advertising and promoting their own festival was another chance to influence public opinion on victory and empire. Where the Festival of Remembrance had previously been a footnote to coverage of the ceremony at the cenotaph it was now the main focus. On the day of the first of the new style of Festival of Remembrance the front page headline in the *Daily Express* declared that "the empire's great remembrance festival" would take place

---

[27] Bingham. A., 'Reading Newspapers: Cultural Histories of the Popular Press in Modern Britain', *History Compass,* 10:2 (2012), pp. 144
[28] 'Cenotaph Wreaths', *The Daily Express*, 10 November 1923, p. 1
[29] 'Cenotaph Wreaths', p. 1; 'Peace Night Plans', *The Daily Express*, 11 November 1925, p. 2
[30] 'A World Requiem', *The Daily Express*, 12 November 1923, p. 11
[31] 'A World Requiem', p. 11
[32] 'A World Requiem', p. 11; 'Pageant of genius at Albert Hall', p. 2

that night and besides paying respects to those who had died the close comradeship that had been cultivated during the war would be celebrated.[33] In 1928 the Royal Albert Hall was described as the "heart of the Empire" and much was made of the attendance of colonial soldiers.[34] By 1929 the Festival in London had been added to by the introduction of a further ten festivals spanning the British Isles. This spread their desired image and mode of remembrance beyond the capital as far as Glasgow and Swansea.[35] The new Festivals of Remembrance sought to portray what Richards has defined as "comradeship, Christian faith and patriotism".[36] The events were often referred to specifically as the "*Daily Express* Festival of Remembrance" and the positive public response and the perceived improvement in the quality of music was consistently reiterated within the newspaper, and was contrasted to the ambivalence shown to Foulds' music and festival.[37] Evidence of a positive response was further supported by the frequent publishing of letters of thanks from readers.[38] The space within a national newspaper was an outlet that had not been available to supporters of Foulds' festival.

It was not simply the conflict between Beaverbrook, the *Daily Express* and Foulds where this contested commemoration was played out however, and there is merit in extending understanding to the wider press. This can be done by examining the behaviour of the BBC and *The Times* in particular. The BBC was established as a corporation in 1927 and took control of the Proms in parallel to the organisation and endorsement of the Festival of Remembrance by the *Daily Express*. The BBC had a self-proclaimed mandate to "inform, educate and entertain".[39] Under the guidance of John Reith the BBC had steered the Proms away from increasingly modern musical compositions towards a traditional and nationalist form of music. This is similar to what was happening with the Festival of Remembrance and the *Daily Express*. The BBC sought to bolster support for the British

[33] 'Armistice Day Celebrations', p. 1
[34] 'Armistice Day Celebrations', *The Daily Express*, 11 November 1927, p. 1
[35] 'Chain Of Remembrance Festivals Throughout Britain', *The Daily Express*, 31 October 1929
[36] Richards, *Imperialism and Music*, p. 161
[37] 'Armistice Day Celebrations', p. 1
[38] 'Countrywide Letters Of Thanks To The *Daily Express*', *The Daily Express*, 18 November 1928, p. 13; 'Ex-Service Men's 'Thank You'', *The Daily Express*, 15 November 1927, p. 3
[39] Mackenzie, J., *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (ed.) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), p. 167

Empire, with both the Proms and Festival of Remembrance able to dictate ideas about remembrance to the public attracted to these events. Van der Linden has strongly implicated Reith as the driving force behind this policy stating that it was under Reith's leadership that the BBC promoted a cocktail of nationalism, monarchism and religious duty.[40] This was an ethos that Reith and the BBC did not find to be incompatible with their role as an objective and impartial agent and it certainly found harmony with Beaverbrook and the *Daily Express*. It is evident that Reith was unconcerned with the duty of truly living up to the policy of "inform, educate and entertain" as a socially conservative pro-empire propaganda was projected through the BBC's output and influence. Because of Reith's pro-empire stance, the BBC favoured an alternative to Foulds' *A World Requiem*, which led to them excluding all of his serious work from broadcast on the radio.[41] Until the end of his tenure at the BBC in 1938, Reith was able to dictate the direction of the BBC to support a personal mandate, just as Beaverbrook was with the *Express*. His autocratic style of leadership can be seen in his prevention of anti-appeasement Conservatives getting airtime in the late 1930s. This again demonstrates the immense power that people in a position to dictate culture held and that they used to shape public taste in line with their personal views.

The Times newspaper was more supportive of Foulds and his work but not consistently so. At one time *A World Requiem* was praised for its daring nature and success in expressing the grief of a generation.[42] The same *Times* article also gives an idea of the public reaction stating the music had given the audience what they needed. Similarly Lord Haig wrote personal letters to all of the choir members that were performing *A World Requiem* urging them all to perform annually in order to raise funds for his armistice appeal.[43] However on a separate occasion a review in *The Times* described Foulds' *Requiem* as having a poverty of musical ideas.[44] This disparity was most likely due to the differing tastes of journalists working for an organisation with no mandate for their approach to Foulds and his work. Although there were quiet voices of support from areas of the press the overwhelming attitude was a negative one. The support of *The Times* and Lord Haig was not enough to save Foulds' Festival from the imperialist and nationalist campaign.

---

[40] van der Linden, *Music and Empire in Britain*, p. 91
[41] van der Linden, *Music and Empire in Britain*, p. 90
[42] 'The Remembrance of the Fallen', *The Times,* 12 November 1928, p. 16
[43] 'The Remembrance of the Fallen', p. 16
[44] *Times*, 12 November 1924, cited in Mansell, 'Musical Modernity', p. 444

A battle of contested commemoration was played out through control of the Festival of Remembrance. At its core it was a clash between Foulds and Beaverbrook and their incompatible visions for remembrance and interwar public spirit. The result was Beaverbrook and the *Daily Express* erasing the work of Foulds and implementing a very "British" Festival of Remembrance. Under the guidance of Foulds' the festival with its centrepiece *A World Requiem* was an often minimalist and emotionally driven site of international mourning. On the other hand the *Daily Express* Festival expressed what was considered to some to be a very British response to the Great War. Camaraderie, Christianity and a celebration of the British Empire took the place of international, trans-religious and introspective grief. The *Daily Express* was used by Beaverbrook to first attack Foulds' Festival of Remembrance and then implement his own vision. The wider press was often forced to take sides with the BBC playing a strong role in the attack on Foulds and *The Times* being more supportive. It is important to note that both versions of the festival struck a chord with the British public and such a realisation helps to nuance the arguments of Fussell and Winter.[45] A case study of the Festival of Remembrance proffers the conclusion that both modern and traditional cultural expressions were able to offer support to a society reeling from the destructive force of a total war. In addition the nature of remembrance could be, and was, dictated by those in control of the Festival.

[45] Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, p. 35; Winter, *Sites of Mourning,* p. 227

CHAPTER ELEVEN

"BIGGLES SORTS IT OUT!" CAPTAIN W.E. JOHNS AND THE REINVENTION OF THE HEROIC IDEAL FOR BRITISH BOYS

BETH HARRIS, DAN DUNNING, DAVID PUGH AND LAURA WINSPEARE

The deeds of the fictional Captain James Bigglesworth, or Biggles as he is better known, captivated the minds of young boys with his daring adventures and courageous behaviour. Through Biggles, his creator, W. E. Johns, sought to reintroduce the Edwardian and Victorian values of heroism and chivalry to the younger male generation in the mid twentieth century. Johns used the glorification of the Great War as a means to recreate the traditional morals of the British Empire: portraying warfare, or at least combat in the air, as a positive activity. Using his vivid descriptions, as well as his personal experiences during the war, Johns created an idealised version of the new and modern war in the air, a vision which would appeal to the young and help to foster the next generation of military pilots. Johns used the comradeship between Biggles and his friends to show a lighter aspect of being involved in warfare, which sometimes presented war as a game. This idea of military pilots and their experiences being perceived as both courageous and commendable reflects that the themes of patriotism, heroism, and fashionable courage were central to the Biggles series. However, although Johns used his book series to show the War in a positive light, he also portrayed the psychological effects of warfare on the protagonist. By doing this, Johns allowed for an emotional connection to be made with Biggles' character, by giving him a sympathetic trait for an audience to empathise with. However, this took nothing away from the fact that, to his readers, Biggles was a "true British hero" created in the mould of Rhodes, David Livingstone and General Gordon.

The Biggles books, spanning a period of 50 years of the hero's life, originally started out as a short story in the aviation magazine *The Popular Flyer* in April 1932. Following the success of that initial story, Johns went on to write a further 96 novels about Biggles over the next four decades. This vast catalogue of books, in which Biggles faced a substantial number of daring scenarios, reflects the popularity of the series and thus its hero; over the course of the post-war period, he swiftly became the archetypal role model for the younger generation of Britain. Biggles was depicted as serving initially with the Royal Flying Corps (R.F.C) in the First World War before taking up a civilian role as a freelance charter pilot between the World Wars. During the Second World War Biggles' adventures once again placed him in the thick of the fighting, whether it was foiling fiendish Japanese plots or battling the Bosch in the skies above North Africa. After the war Biggles was shown to once again take up a civilian role, hired by his friend and former commanding officer Colonel Raymond, as a flying detective for Scotland Yard. Through the character of Biggles, John's created a traditional British hero, honoured with military decorations, whose adventures did not stop with the end of hostilities in 1945.

The origins of this heroic character can be seen in the early books. In those texts that placed Biggles in the midst of the First World War, he was shown as having to regularly demonstrate his bravery and courage. For example, in his first combat action, Biggles trapped and shot down a German pilot; in the real conflict this would have been an unusual feat for an unbloodied pilot.[1] His fictional exploits during the war were nothing short of remarkable as it appears that he could claim 32 kills, a total matched by only ten real British pilots. For his heroism during the war the character of Biggles was awarded the Distinguished Service Order (D.S.O) and the Military Cross with Bar. It is this idea of bravely defeating the enemy that immediately cemented Biggles as a fictional national hero.

However, it was not just his military prowess; the heroic side of Biggles was further emphasised by Johns by the way that he described his physical attributes and his personality. Biggles was presented as: "a slim boyish figure clad in khaki slacks and a tunic soiled with innumerable oil stains".[2]

---

[1] Butts, Denis, 'Biggles: A Hero of the Air' in Jones, D & Watkins, T (eds.) *A Necessary Fantasy? The Heroic Figure in Children's Popular Culture* (New York: Garland Publishing, 2000), p. 137.

[2] Johns, W.E., *Biggles of the Camel squadron* (London: Thames Publishing Co. 1934), p. 85

He and his fellow airmen were "decent, brave, tough and fair – and very skilful at their jobs", characteristics appealing to the young generation of boys in inter-war Britain. [3] The description continued to add that his face was "pale and stern, with little tired lines round the corners of his mouth. But the eyes were clear and bright, and seemed to gaze into the infinite distance as if seeking something beyond".[4] This description evoked a more human side of Biggles through the determination that is evident in his eyes, whilst at the same time showing the toll of war with some signs of ageing. Johns ensured that Biggles embodied the stereotypical model of the heroic Victorian explorers and soldiers, displaying great valour in the face of overwhelming odds. In many of the stories Biggles possessed an archetypal British "stiff upper lip", simultaneously showcasing his bravado whilst also portraying his heroic attribute of being able to escape the most precarious of situations. In the early novels Biggles' age, being only a teenager when war broke out in 1914, was another attribute that would have attracted and inspired the young readership that W.E Johns aimed his books towards and once again gave the younger generation a hero to aspire to.

The simple fact that W.E. Johns based his character on an airman rather than a soldier in the trenches reinforces the idea of heroism, as the war on the ground was viewed as a horrific experience by the poets and writers in the inter-war era. According to Steve Call most written works were negative and the war was portrayed as ugly and brutal, but the fighting in the skies produced an air of excitement and chivalry.[5] This code of chivalry is extended in the Biggles books to several of Biggles' German opponents who had done Bigglesworth a good turn themselves. For example, in *Biggles of the Camel Squadron,* when battling a German pilot, Von Doering, Biggles could have been shot down but instead the German decided not to attack him. This gesture was reciprocated a few days later when the German was warned by Biggles of the approach of British fighters. Biggles stated that "I must have been crazy to give Von Doering that signal! I wonder what must have come over me. Still one good turn

[3] Anon, 'Introduction' in Johns, W.E., *Biggles' Big Adventures* (London: Prion, 2010), p. 7
[4] Johns, W.E., *Biggles of the Camel squadron* (London: Thames Publishing Co. 1934), p. 85
[5] Call, S., *Selling Air Power: Military Aviation & American Popular Culture after World War II* (Texas: A&M University Press 2009), p. 15

deserves another, and we're quits now!"[6] Johns depicted Biggles as being brave and fair, and able to experience a war where such characteristics could have a positive impact.

Biggles' disregard of authority also served to heighten the ideal of the true British hero. This is because he was often portrayed as willing to break the rules and regulations to complete the missions that he undertook. His constant insubordination led to some of his more daring adventures. This again reflects the fantasy of the freedom of the skies; had Biggles been in the infantry, he would surely have been punished for his actions. Johns took advantageous of the fact that the R.F.C had been recently formed, and that few officers had experience of aerial combat. This led to a perceived relaxation of the rules which gave the author the freedom to create a heroic figure. Biggles' heroic reputation was somewhat tarnished by the traditional Imperialistic ideals presented through his character. The story 'The Adventures of the Luminous Clay', emphasised this point as Biggles was portrayed as showing little concern for the local population; instead he represented the harsher reality of protecting British interests above all else.[7] This reflects popularly held views about British supremacy and how many of the books glorified both warfare and Empire.

In addition to creating a hero, Johns also glorified war. Erich Remarque noted that his book, *All Quiet on the Western Front,* is "neither an accusation nor a confession, and least of all an adventure, for death is not an adventure for those who stand face to face with it."[8] This is in contrast to Johns' view that during the 1930s healthy boys had an appetite for adventure and would do anything that involved a risk to life.[9] Also as the war in the air was a modern concept, experimental in nature, this novelty increased the interest in the air force during the inter-war period. It was believed that when the Second World War broke out, many men volunteered due to the adventures of Biggles, thus demonstrating the impact of the book series on young men.[10] Following 1918, the idea of

[6] Johns, W.E., *Biggles of the Camel squadron* (London: Thames Publishing Co. 1934), p. 122
[7] Ward, S., 'Introduction' in Ward, S. (ed.) *British culture and the end of empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), pp. 1-20
[8] Remarque, E.M., *All Quiet on the Western Front* (London: Putnam & Company 1970)
[9] Johns, W.E., *The Boy Biggles* (London: Purnell & Sons Ltd), p. 7
[10] Wilson, A.N. 'World of Books: Flights of Fantasy with Biggles and T.E Lawrence' July 2004, *The Telegraph Media Group Limited.*

aerial combat grew rapidly in popularity because of its association with romantic glamour, a characteristic that, although associated with the great Victorian explorers, had not until this point been used in conjuncture with warfare.

While most war literature was written for adults, Johns' books offered an insight on warfare for the adolescent males during the inter-war period. Biggles was seen by Johns as having the potential to be a role model for the new generation of readers after the First World War, hoping that the character would prove to be an inspiration.[11] He noted that his first Biggles novel, *Biggles of the Camel Squadron* (1934) was: "written more for entertainment of the younger generation than the hard baked warrior."[12] This was, for Johns, a new experience as his earlier works had not been tailored towards a younger audience. His works were one of the most popular ways that warfare was presented to younger audiences in the 1930s. Many other novels, specifically those dedicated to the war in the trenches, were however more suited for an older readership. As the inter-war years progressed, the number of air related stories continued to grow and by the end of the 1930s it was clear that the genre had become very popular and the Biggles books were no exception to this.

Through glorifying war, it could argued that Johns' played on the naivety of his readers to present a false portrayal of conflict. The depiction of war in the Biggles books differed greatly from the reality of the mud and blood in the trenches of the First World War. Biggles' encounters with death are very underwhelming, with the hero always coming through to win the day. The idea that war was a game was a significant theme in the Biggles series. The friendly rivalry that Biggles enjoyed with Captain Wilkinson is evidence of this idea. For example, in one of the stories a competition was set up to see which pilot could drop propaganda leaflets furthest over the enemy lines for the prize of a gramophone.[13] Also the two friends' rivalry extended to the number of kills that could be made in one day and this shows apathy towards killing and death during the First World War. W.E. Johns also uses heroic language to emphasise both the glorification of war

---

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/anwilson/3608361/World-of-books.html#

[11] Trendler, J. 'Foreword' in Johns, W.E., *Biggles in France* (London: Random House Children's Books, 1993), p. 8

[12] Johns, W.E., *Biggles of the Camel Squadron* (London: Purnell & Sons Ltd 1934), p. 6

[13] Johns, W.E., *Biggles in France*, pp. 152-173

and the heroic nature of his character. By using language that would have more suited to both the circles that Biggles moved in and the bygone age he belonged to, Johns related his character back to the golden age of the true British hero, the Victorian era.

Although Johns' mainly focused on heroism and the glorification of conflict, he did not ignore psychological effects of the Great War. W.E Johns created Biggles to a heroic figure, who would be seen as a role model to a generation of young boys in the inter-war years. However, there was a side to Biggles' character which demonstrated the psychological traumas that came with fighting in the war. Nigel Hunt exemplifies the trauma of war by arguing that "many people have psychological problems as a direct consequence of war".[14] Traumatic events meant that many of the soldiers serving were subject to devastating circumstances that not only affected them physically, but also mentally. W.E Johns' emphasis was not just on the skill of his hero but the cruelty of war including psychological damage.[15] This cruelty in war extended for Biggles, as he was witness to many deaths of his beloved comrades. The brave teenager Biggles was no exception to psychological trauma. Denis Butts has stated that Biggles was depicted as a "patriotic, skilful and highly strung young man, who several times comes close to tears, even hysteria, when comrades are lost".[16] Here Butts demonstrates that even heroic figures, like Biggles, were mentally affected by the death and disaster that followed them during the war. This allowed a different side to Biggles' character to be seen, as he is presented as vulnerable and emotional in regards to the death of his friends and comrades. An example of this is *The Black Peril* (1935), where Johns wrote that Biggles "for an hour, hunted looking for what he hoped he would not find, the dead or unconscious body of his friend".[17] The fact that Johns referred to Biggles' comrades as friends, implies that their newfound friendship was one of the few happier aspects of Biggles' war experience. It also showed the emotional connection between the men during the war. The character of Biggles hoped that he would not have to deal with the death or trauma in finding the body of one of his close

[14] Hunt, N.C., *Memory, War and Trauma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 2
[15] Butts, D., 'Imperialist of the Air: Flying Stories 1900-1950' in Richards, J (ed.) *Imperialism and Juvenile Literature* (Manchester University Press: Manchester), p. 130
[16] Butts, 'Biggles: A Hero of the Air', p. 137
[17] Johns, W.E., *Biggles and the Black Peril* (London: Red Fox Edition, 2004), p. 28

friends. Events such as this would have contributed to the psychological trauma that most soldiers and pilots would have experienced. This example reiterates the point that the soldiers and pilots were surrounded by death which could cause psychological strain during the conflict. The idea of comradeship is further commented on by Neil Clark who states: "when Biggles is presumed captured or dead in enemy-occupied Monaco in *Biggles Fails to Return* there is no question that his pals will risk their own lives to try to rescue him'.[18] It appears that Johns presented friendship between the comrades in order to show the psychological effects that would have occurred when these friendships were lost.

Johns' glorification of war in the Biggles books served to enhance the heroic reputation of his character. This was done by utilising the idea that war was a game where death was just another daily occurrence, and this could encourage boys to join up and serve their country. In reality it is the writing style of Johns that ultimately made the character of Biggles into a true British hero. Through both the descriptive language he used and the attributes Johns gave him, Biggles was transformed from just another pilot, into one of the greatest fictional heroes of the twentieth century. The stories were a positive response to the war as an alternative to the more common response that military conflict was tragic to those who endured it. Although the version of war presented in the Biggles series was a false and romanticized, the stories were very popular. In Biggles, W.E. Johns recreated the true British hero, stiff upper lip and all. Despite the adversity he faced, Biggles always remained calm and steadfast in the face of danger. Whether being shot at by Huns, battling indigenous peoples or flying his Spitfire at 10,000 feet, Biggles was the epitome of the British heroic figure.

[18] Clark, N, 'Why the World Needs Biggles more than Ever' May 2004: *The Telegraph Media Group Limited,*
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/3673437/Why-the-world-needs-Biggles-more-than-ever.html

CHAPTER TWELVE

CRISIS OF FAITH? C.S. LEWIS, RELIGION AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR

NICHOLA TONKS AND KATHERINE SYKES

At age 17, C.S. Lewis said "I believe in no religion. There is absolutely no proof for any of them".[1] It is therefore surprising that the man who made this particular statement became so well known for his faith. This chapter explores how Lewis became the prolific writer of Christian materials such as *The Four Loves* and T*he Chronicles of Narnia*, and to what extent his experiences during the First World War affected his faith and his search for markers of transcendent reality, which Lewis termed "Joy".[2] Lewis famously wrote of his time in the trenches that he "… never sank so low as to pray".[3] This particular choice of words suggests that, at the time, Lewis saw faith, and the way in which it was being used by soldiers in the trenches, as a crutch for the weak. This paper considers the experience of war and how it strengthened faith by discussing the extent to which Christianity was used as a coping mechanism by combatants. C.S. Lewis is examined as a case study; the ways in which he handled his experiences demonstrates how the experience of war affected the faith of the British soldier in a multitude of ways, and that its after-effects can be seen for decades after leaving the trenches.

Rather than writing of his time as a soldier immediately after returning from the War, Lewis seemed to retreat into his own world and internalise his experiences, which he then expressed through his writing, especially in the poetry and fantasy literature that he penned later in his life. Instead of

---

[1] Downing D.C., *The Most Reluctant Convert: C.S. Lewis' Journey to Faith* (Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2002), p. 11

[2] Lewis, C.S., *Surprised by Joy* (London: Fount Paperbacks, 1997)

[3] Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, p. 11

returning to faith in the trenches, his wartime experiences were something that Lewis processed over time, resulting in the assimilation of both war and faith in his literary works. Lewis has described himself as "the man who dreamed of fairyland",[4] which is a reference to the poem of the same name by W. B. Yeats.[5] The poem tells the story of a man that withdrew from the worries of his life into a fantasy world and tried to escape his realities by retreating to a land of imagination. Therefore, Lewis acknowledged that he used his literary capabilities as a coping mechanism; he used this ability, rather than religion, to protect himself mentally from the ravages of war. In this respect, Lewis was not with the majority; holding onto faith helped many people both through the First World War and in dealing with their experiences in the aftermath. While Lewis did indeed return to his faith in his thirties, it was not directly linked to his time as a soldier as it was for many. Ultimately, his coping mechanism was his expressive writing.

It is a commonly held view that C.S. Lewis was a "convert" to Christianity in later life, as this was when much of his writings on Christianity appeared; however, this was not the case. His close friend, J. R. R Tolkien said Lewis found Christianity "not […] by a new door but by an old one", which suggests that Christianity was certainly something Lewis was not new to and that in many ways he returned to the faith of his youth.[6] Christianity had filled Lewis's early years in his parental household.[7] His maternal grandfather had been the Rector of their local church, St Mark's of Strandtown in Ireland, and his parents and, in turn, Lewis's upbringings were staunchly Protestant.[8] Lewis's mother passed away when he was just nine years of age, and it is at this point in his life that he was sent away to school. During this period, Lewis started to think deeply about the existence of God, what faith meant and his moments of Joy. While at school at Wynyard, he was forced to attend church twice weekly and he felt that although he was going through the motions of being a Christian, his heart and mind were not behind it.[9] After leaving Wynyard, Lewis

[4] Wain J., 'Teaching C S Lewis', *The American Scholar*, 50 (1981), pp. 73-80
[5] Yeats W. B, 'The Man Who Dreamed of Faeryland' in Watts C (Ed.), The Collected Poems of W.B. Yeats (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000), p. 35
[6] Tolkien quoted in, Wilson A.N., *C.S. Lewis: A Biography* (London: Flamingo, 1991), p. 135
[7] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* pp. 21-2
[8] St Marks Parish Office, *C.S. Lewis and St Marks*, 2009, accessed 27 March 2014, http://dundela.down.anglican.org/stmarks_cslewis.html
[9] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 43

noted that two people had a profound influence on the way in which he questioned the world. One was his matron at Cherborg School, who was a spiritualist that dabbled in the occult. The other was his private tutor of his adolescence, William Kirkpatrick, who Lewis described as a "pugnacious atheist".[10] It was while residing with Kirkpatrick that Lewis wrote *The Quest for Bleheris*, an unfinished manuscript that chronicles the search for a deity and contains much satire about religion.[11] The struggles of the main character Bleheris almost mirror Lewis's own at this time and as such this could be the first example of Lewis internalising his feelings and exporting them into a fantasy land on paper. C.S. Lewis's journey to faith was not direct, but a full circle whereby his belief in God came back to its roots in the Christian faith of his youth with a diversion through Spiritualism, gnostic dualism and outright atheism during his adolescence and his time at war.

Despite Lewis being a self-declared atheist, he would have had to choose a religion upon enlisting in the army. During the First World War, all rank and file soldiers had to declare a specific religion which would then go on their identity discs.[12] This was required in order to send them to the correct place for burial in the event of their death; those who did not have religion were told to mark down that they were Church of England.[13] Therefore, everyone who enlisted was defined by their affiliation with a religion, even if they were not religious. Callum Brown argues that "the Christian faith was regarded as central to soldiering and to national leadership" during the war, which suggests that religion was still seen as an integral component of military life and that the faith and religion of soldiers was still considered important.[14] Not only did the many soldiers who were already religious pray in the trenches, but also those who had previously been agnostic or lapsed in their faith began to pray too. They prayed for the safety of their families, for strength going into battle and gave thanks to God for their survival on their return.[15] Michael Snape and Stephen Parker

[10] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* pp. 45-51
[11] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* pp. 66-78
[12] Brown C, *Religion and Society in Twentieth Century Britain* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2006), p. 90
[13] Brown, *Religion and Society,* p. 90
[14] Brown, *Religion and Society,* p. 88
[15] Brown, *Religion and Society,* p. 96; Wilkinson, A., *The Church of England and the First World War* (London: SCM Press, 1978), p. 163

have argued that not only have the connections made between war and secularisation been "fundamentally misconceived", but that atheism only had a marginal appeal among soldiers that fought in the Great War. Moreover, D. S. Cairns posited in 1919 that some sort of belief in God during the war was "almost universal"; faith and belief of some kind was widespread.[16]

However, praying in the trenches did not necessarily equate to a resolute faith in God and Christianity, as some soldiers used praying as a coping mechanism to deal with the fear and horrors of war. Brown has argued this particular type of faith had been seen by some of the clergy as a form of "emergency religion", a self-preservation tool that was more akin to superstition.[17] Similarly, Richard Schweitzer has argued that, for the most part, the faith of the rank and file soldier fluctuated depending on the situation he found himself in.[18] This sort of "emergency religion" may have been the kind of faith that Lewis was referring to when he said that "he never sank so low as to pray'; Lewis saw it as foolish to use religion as a crutch by praying out of fear.[19] Although this was the reaction of many soldiers, C.S. Lewis did not feel the need to pray for his own survival to a God he had no belief in. To cope with life in the trenches Lewis, much like "The Man Who Dreamed of Faeryland", preferred to lose himself in literature, reading titles by George Eliot among many others.[20]

David Downing posits in his book, *C.S. Lewis: The Most Reluctant Convert* that "it may be necessary to lose one's faith in order to save it"; [21] this statement seems particularly indicative of Lewis's own spiritual journey. In 1917, the young C.S. Lewis enrolled in the Officer Training Corps which K. J. Gilchrist suggests was an attempt to delay being

---

Porter P., 'Review of *The Cross and the trenches: Religious Faith and Doubt Among British and American Great War Soldiers* by Richard Schweitzer' in *War in History*, 11:4, 2004, pp. 460

[16] Snape M. and Parker S., 'Keeping Faith and Coping: belief, popular religiosity and the British people' in Bourne, J., Liddle, P. and Whitehead, I. (eds.) *The Great War 1914-45: Who Won? Who Lost?* (London: Harper Collins, 2000), p. 400; Snape M, *God and the British Soldier: Religion and the British Army in the First and Second World Wars* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. X

[17] Brown, *Religion and Society,* p. 94

[18] Porter P, 'Review of *The Cross*', p. 461

[19] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 11

[20] Gilchrist K.J., *A Morning After War: C.S. Lewis and WWI* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2005), p. 92

[21] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 48

dispatched to the front.[22] However, as an Irish National Lewis was exempt from conscription and, furthermore, once in France he was given the option to transfer to a less dangerous position but declined and opted to stay with his battalion.[23] This refutes Gilchrist's assumptions and shows Lewis to be loyal to both the country he felt he belonged to, and to the men with whom he was serving. Right at the start of Lewis's time at war, he was already viewing his situation with a modicum of literary detachment and likened the battlefields of France to Homer's *Odyssey.* He wrote: "This is war. This is what you have read about in Homer…".[24] The first few months of his active service were relatively quiet until he developed trench fever in February 1918 and spent a month in Trèport Hospital, where he wrote often to his friend Arthur Greeves about the books he had the time to devour during his convalescence.[25] Once well enough, Lewis was sent back to the front line where he served a further three weeks of active combat before being wounded by an allied shell which fell short and he was transported back to England.[26]

Lewis later described his First World War experiences as "tame" and at times rather boring; for example, in *Surprised by Joy*, he explained how army life was different than he had expected it to be and he was astounded that he did not hate it more.[27] This portrayal of his experience of war is very different to the brutal shock described in so many soldier's accounts and the gruesome accounts that featured the war poetry of the period. Although there are few specific examples where Lewis wrote about the sights he saw, he did experience the same horrors as many other soldiers but chose not to write about them explicitly. Lewis wrote *Spirits in Bondage* while at war and the book was published in 1919, and the book focuses more atheism than on graphic war depictions.[28] Consequently, *Spirits in Bondage* was not well received by his religious family; his brother Warren wrote to their father worrying that Lewis had "advertised himself as an atheist" in the poems.[29] Their father replied defensively that

[22] Gilchrist, *A Morning After War,* p. 69
[23] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 83; Wain J, 'Teaching C S Lewis', pp. 73-80;
[24] Gilchrist, *A Morning After War,* p. 159
[25] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 83; Gilchrist, *A Morning After War,* p. 92
[26] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 83
[27] Lewis, *Surprised by Joy,* pp. 141-152
[28] Gilchrist, *A Morning After War,* p. 204
[29] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 90

his son would "learn in time that a man has not absolutely solved the riddle of the heavens above […] at [the age of] twenty', but still forbade his son from giving a copy of it to the servants, lest they should follow his ideas.[30]

When compared to the work of writers such as Siegfried Sassoon, *Spirits in Bondage* was not graphic in its explanations of war. Lewis once wrote that he thought Sassoon was "a horrid man", partly due to his descriptions of war which were rather frank and because his work reminded Lewis of his recurring nightmares.[31] Whilst he was prolific in writing about his views on atheism and religion, Lewis was not so forthcoming with putting pen to paper regarding his feelings about his time spent in France during the war. In a passage taken from *Surprised by Joy*, he wrote:

> I put the war on one side to a degree which some people will think shameful and others incredible. Others will call it a flight from reality. I maintain that it was rather a treaty with reality[32]

This is indicative of how Lewis dealt with his experiences; he simply put it to "one side" to be dealt with later. It was not until the long poem *Dymer* (1926) where the literary emotional embodiment of Lewis's war experiences can be seen. Battle scenes within the poem are reminiscent of those that Lewis saw in Flanders and the central character Dymer encounters a wounded man that had been injured in the battle. Through the injured man's tale, faint echoes of Lewis's own story can be heard, for example:

> Then charge and cheer and bubbling sobs of death,
> We hovered on their front. Like swarming bees
> Their bullets came – no time for breath.
> I saw men's stomachs fall out on their knees;
> And shouting faces, while they shouted freeze.[33]

This seems a somewhat contradictory piece of writing when Lewis's view of Sassoon's work is considered, yet, by the time that Lewis wrote *Dymer,* he had had time to reflect on his experiences at war. It seems that, to an extent, *Dymer* is Lewis's way of cleansing himself of the grief and trauma. The battles set in the *Narnia* chronicles also contain a moderate amount of

---

[30] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 90
[31] Gilchrist, *A Morning After War,* p. 193
[32] Wain J, 'Teaching C S Lewis', pp. 73-80
[33] Lewis, C.S., *Dymer*, cited in Gilchrist, *A Morning After War,* p. 210

violence, which again shows that Lewis was drawing on his own experiences, although he was less graphic while writing for a younger audience and chose to show that light and heroic bravery could overcome dark and evil.[34] Furthermore, Lewis once said that "a fairy-tale liberates archetypes which dwell in the […] unconscious".[35] This can be seen in *The Magician's Nephew* which was based on Lewis's early life and the bonds between siblings and friends throughout the other *Narnia* books are reminiscent of the ties he felt to his brother Warren and to his battalion during the war. Thus, the same cathartic literary expressions can be seen not just of his horrific war experiences, but also the ones that were not so painful for him to recall such as the bonds between combatants. Camaraderie was a big part of Lewis's army life, and as such it was something which he looked back on fondly; he wrote of his time at war that: "...Every few days one seemed to meet a […] man of good will".[36] An example of this included one of his first nights in France when two Canadian men took him under their wing and treated him like a long lost friend, for which he remained ever grateful. This is the type of war experience that Lewis later used in his works, especially in the *Narnia Chronicles*. In *The Lion, The Witch and The Wardrobe,* for example, the Beavers take in the four Pevensie children, feed them and clothe them as if they had always known them as they were fighting for the same side.[37] In *The Silver Chair*, Puddleglum the Marshwiggle takes Eustace and Jill in, feeds them well and then accompanies them on a danger fraught journey to help them despite having only just met them.[38] These are but two of many examples which run through Lewis's works of fiction which echo his war experiences and the good nature of strangers who offered help, kindness and friendship who were fighting the same battle.

Lewis explored his ideas of friendship, love and camaraderie in *The Four Loves*, specifically within his concepts of "Need-love" and "Friendship-love". Need Love, he wrote, is experienced by everyone, such as the need of a scared young boy for his mother or of a fellow man in need of some company, both of which were common feelings for soldiers to experience

---

[34] Downing, D.C, *Into the Wardrobe: C.S. Lewis and the Narnia Chronicles* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005), p. 154
[35] Downing, *Into the Wardrobe*, p. 34
[36] Lewis, *Surprised by Joy,* p. 146
[37] Lewis, C.S., *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, The Witch and The Wardrobe,* First published Geoffrey Bles 1950 (London: Harper Collins, 2001), p. 72-86
[38] Lewis, C.S., *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Silver Chair,* First published Geoffrey Bles 1953 (London: Harper Collins, 2001) pp. 77-259

during the pressures of warfare. Friendship love, however, is not a need but a desire formed when two companions or a group of individuals share a common interest or experience such as war. Within *The Four Loves* Lewis posited the importance of Friendship love and its key role in society, although he recognised it is not a necessity, he believed that friendship can boost morale. This analysis of relationships is another literary example where Lewis took his experiences of the war and later used them in his writing.

In addition to the camaraderie and echoes of Lewis's notion of need-love and friendship-love within *The Chronicles of Narnia*, the books also have Christian moral overtones. The lion Aslan represents God throughout the Chronicles; Aslan creates Narnia in *The Magician's Nephew*, he is ever present but not always seen throughout the Chronicles and also brings about an apocalypse in which the stars return home at the end of the series in *The Last Battle*.[39] A close friend and student of Lewis's, Dom Bede Griffiths, said:

> The figure of Aslan tells us more of how Lewis understood the nature of God than anything else he wrote. It has all the hidden power and majesty and awesomeness which Lewis associated with God, but also all the glory and tenderness and even humour which he believed belonged to Him.[40]

However, while Griffiths argued that Lewis's personal spirituality can be explicitly seen in the *Chronicles,* Lewis stated: "you must not confuse my romances with my theses".[41] It seems the Chronicles were just fictional representations of faith while in *Surprised by Joy*, C.S. Lewis gave a detailed account of his own spiritual journey. Here, Lewis explored his

---

[39] Lewis, C.S., *The Chronicles of Narnia: Prince Caspian*, First published Geoffrey Bles 1951 (London: Harper Collins, 2001)
Lewis, C.S., *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Horse and His Boy*, First published Geoffrey Bles 1954 (London: Harper Collins, 2001)
Lewis, C.S., *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Last Battle,* First published The Bodley Head 1956 (London: Harper Collins, 2001)
Lewis, *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, The Witch and The Wardrobe.*
Lewis, C.S., *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Magician's Nephew*, First published The Bodley Head 1955 (London: Harper Collins, 2001)
Lewis, *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Silver Chair.*
Lewis, C.S., *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Voyage of the Dawn Treader,* First published Geoffrey Bles 1952 (London: Harper Collins, 2001)
[40] Downing, *Into the Wardrobe*, p. 35
[41] Downing, *Into the Wardrobe*, p. 78

attempts to find "Joy" and his reluctance to accept religion throughout his teens and early adulthood. Within the book, Lewis acknowledged his faith as a young child, admitting that it was only when he was able to think for himself that he began to question the ideas behind religion.[42] Therefore, his confession of his early Christianity positively refutes later statements referring to him as a "convert".[43] Lewis found his religion once again in later life; his spirituality merely laid dormant, and his Theism and later Christianity were not entirely new beliefs. David Downing notes that Lewis's years spent as an "unbeliever" makes his Christian books even more captivating because Lewis understands the arguments of Atheism so well.[44]

One of the primary motives for Lewis's reluctance to follow a religious path was the obscurity of it all; he wanted his soul to be his and his mind to avoid corruption. As a teenager he said: "You know, I think, that I believe in no religion. There is absolutely no proof of any of them, and from a philosophical standpoint Christianity is not even the best.'[45] He also referred to the notions of the supernatural as the "reasoning of a drunkard" and remained reserved in any idea of an afterlife. Lewis saw a move towards religion as a "...Total surrender, the absolute leap in the dark".[46] Thus, it was not until 1929 that he finally accepted some form of God and knelt and prayed, when writing of this experience he said: "that night, [I was] the most dejected and reluctant convert in all England", but still his concept of God differed from popular belief.[47] He saw the last step in his "conversion" as the move from Theism to Christianity, which happened slowly and he accepted grudgingly. Lewis based his beliefs on logic and reasoning and he did not embrace Christianity until he could no longer argue against it.[48] From this point, until the end of his life, Lewis, who was already a respected scholar in his own right, became a prolific writer of Christian theism and children's literature.

---

[42] Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, pp. 4-5
[43] Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, p. ix
[44] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 15
[45] Lewis, C.S. His views on religion in a letter to Arthur Greeves, in Carpenter, H. *The Inklings: CS Lewis, JRR Tolkien, Charles Williams and their Friends* (London: Unwin Paperbacks, 1982), p. 7
[46] Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, p. 177
[47] Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, p. 178
[48] Carpenter, *The Inklings,* pp. 40-42

The experiences of the First World War presented Lewis with many challenges physically and spiritually, but unlike many soldiers he did not lean on the kind of "emergency faith" that many other soldiers relied upon. While the experience of the war only served to return many to their childhood faiths Lewis remained disconnected from Christian faith of any type during his time on the front. Lewis was, to a large extent, an anomaly in regards to his determination to remain atheist whilst exploring gnostic dualism. Instead of the belief of a God watching over him, Lewis found his comfort in logic, reason and literature. It was in his writing that Lewis found pleasure; he liked to write in the evenings to unwind and enjoyed the physical act of dipping pen in ink.[49] This suggests that for Lewis, writing was a cathartic habit, and in his literary works his feelings and memories were explored. In *The Chronicles of Narnia*, Aslan represents the God that Lewis had struggled with for so long during his adolescence, and the battle scenes are reminiscent of those he experienced during his time served in the First World War. Thus, even though Lewis downplayed his war experiences in many of his writings, it is evident through his literary works that he did not remain as unaffected as first appears.

[49] Downing, *The Most Reluctant Convert,* p. 133

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

The Liddle Collection, Special Collections, The Brotherton Library, University of Leeds.

Printed Primary Sources

Baynes, E.H. *Animal Heroes of the Great War* (The MacMillan Company, 1925).

Brittain, V. *Testament of Youth* (London: Virago Press Ltd, 1978).

Cairns D S, *The Army and Religion: An Enquiry and its Bearing Upon the Religious Life of the Nation* (London: Macmillan, 1919).

Cohen, I. *The Ruhleben Prison Camp: A record of nineteen months' internment* (London: Methuen, 1917).

Gribble, F. 'Leaves from a Ruhleben Notebook', *Fortnightly Review* (Jan 1916) pp. 60-70.

Hart-Davis, R. (ed.) *Siegfried Sassoon diaries, 1915-1918* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983).

Hooper W. (ed.) *All My Road Before Me: The Diary of C. S. Lewis 1922-1927 (*London: Harper Collins, 1991).

Johns, W.E. *Biggles and the Black Peril* (London: Red Fox Edition, 2004).

—. *Biggles in France* (London, Random House Children's Books, 1993)

—. *Biggles of the Camel Squadron* (London: Purnell & Sons Ltd 1934).

—. *The Boy Biggles* (London: Purnell & Sons Ltd, 1968).

Junger, E. *Storm of Steel* (London: Penguin, 2004).

Kilby, C.S. (ed.) *C. S. Lewis: Letters to an American Lady* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967)

Lewis, C.S. *Surprised by Joy* (London: Fount Paperbacks, 1997).

—. *The Four Loves* (London: Collins, 1960).

—. *The Problem of Pain (*London: Harper Collins, 1990)

—. *The Screwtape Letters* (London: Harper Collins, 1992)

Mahoney, Henry Charles. *Sixteen months in four German prisons: Wesel, Sennelager, Klingelputz, Ruhleben* (London: S. Low, Marston & Co. ltd. 1917)

Miller, F. T, *True Stories of the Great War* (New York: Review of Reviews Company, 1917)
Remarque, E.M. *All Quiet on the Western Front* (London: Putnam & Company 1970).
Walter, G. (ed.) *The Penguin book of First World War poetry* (London: Penguin, 2006).

Newspapers

The Daily Express, 1923-29.
The Times, 1914-28

Secondary Sources

Printed Books

Agnew, K. and Fox, G. (eds.) *Children at War: From the Great War to the Gulf* (London: Continuum, 2001)
Aitkin, J. *A War of Individuals, Bloomsbury attitudes to the Great War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
Andrews, E.M. *The Anzac Illusion: Anglo-Australian Relations During World War I* (Australia: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
Augier, F.R. *The Making of the West Indies* (London: Longman, 1960).
Barlow A. *The Great War in British Literature (*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
Beckett, I.F.W. *The Great War 1914-1918* (Harlow: Pearson Longman 2007).
Bergonzi, B. *Heroes' Twilight: A Study of the Literature of the Great War* Third edition (Manchester: Carcanet, 1996).
Black, J., *The Great War and the Making of the Modern World* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011).
Bourke, J. *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War* (London: Reaktion, 1999).
—. *An Intimate History of Killing: Face-To-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare* (London: Granta, 1999).
Bourne, J.M., Liddle, P. & Whitehead, I. (eds.) *The Great War 1914-45: Who Won? Who Lost?* Two Volumes (London: Harper Collins, 2000-2).
—. *Britain and the Great War 1914-1918* (London: Edward Arnold, 1989).

Brady, S. *Masculinity and Male Homosexuality in Britain, 1861-1913* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
Calder, K.J. *Britain and the Origins of the New Europe, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
Carpenter H. *The Inklings: CS Lewis, JRR Tolkien, Charles Williams and their Friends* (London: Unwin Paperbacks, 1982).
Cecil, H. and Liddle P. (eds.) *Facing Armageddon: The First World War Experienced* (London: Leo Cooper, 1996).
Cole, S. *Modernism, Male Friendship, and The First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
Cooper, J. *Animals in War* (Great Britain: William Heinenman Ltd., 1983)
Damousi, J. and Lake, M. (eds) *Gender and War: Australians at War in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1995)
Das, S. *Touch and Intimacy in First World War Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
Downing D.C. *The Most Reluctant Convert: C. S. Lewis' Journey to Faith* (Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2002).
Eksteins, M. *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age* (London: Papermac, 2000)
Ferguson, N. *The Pity of War* (London: Penguin, 1999).
Freedman, L. (ed.) *War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
Fuller, J. *Troop Morale and Popular Culture in the British and Dominion Armies 1914-1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
Fussell, P. *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
George, R. *British Culture and the First World War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).
Gilbert, M. *First World War* (London: Harper Collins, 1995).
Gilchrist K.J. *A Morning After War: C. S. Lewis and WWI* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2005).
Goebel, S. *The Great War and Medieval Memory: War, Remembrance and Medievalism in Britain and Germany, 1914-1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
Goldstein, E. *Winning the Peace: British Diplomatic Strategy, Peace Planning, and the Paris Peace Conference 1916-1920* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991).
Goodall, F. *We Will Not Go to War: Conscientious Objectors during the World Wars* (Stroud: The History Press, 2010).
Harvey, A D. *A Muse of Fire: Literature, Art and War* (London: Hambledon Press, 1998).

Hicks, P. *Animal Bravery in Wartime: Beyond the Call of Duty* (London: Wayland, 2014).
Hunt, N.C. *Memory, War and Trauma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
Hynes, S. *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (London: Random House, 2011).
Joll, J., *The Origins of the First World War,* Second Edition (Harlow: Longman Group, 1992).
Jones, D. and Watkins, T. (eds.) *A Necessary Fantasy? The Heroic Figure in Children's Popular Culture* (New York: Garland Publishing, 2000).
Ketchum, J.D., *Ruhleben, a Prison Camp Society* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965).
Kingsbury, C. *For Home and Country: World War I Propaganda on the Home Front* (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2010).
Knight, F. *The Caribbean: The Genesis of a Fragmented Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
Lake, M. and Reynolds, H. (eds.) *What's Wrong with ANZAC? The Militarism of Australian History* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd, 2010).
Louis, W.R and Brown, J.M. (eds.) *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol.4: The Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1999).
Low, G (ed). *ANZACS at War* (London: Carlton, 2007).
Mackenzie, J. *Propaganda and Empire: Manipulation of British Public Opinion*, 1880-1960 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).
MacLeod, J. *Reconsidering Gallipoli* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).
McDonald, M. *John Foulds and his Music.* (London: Kahn and Averill, 2006).
McKenzie. J. *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995).
Meyer, J. *Men of War, Masculinity and the First World War in Britain.* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
Morrow, J.H. *The Great War: An Imperial History*. (London: Routledge 2004).
Mosse, G. *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
Pick, D. *War Machine: the Rationalisation of Slaughter in the Modern Age* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1993).
Porter, B. *Absent-Minded Imperialists: Empire, Society and Culture in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Prior, R. *Gallipoli: The End of the Myth* (Bodmin: MPG Books, 2010).
Proctor, T.M. *Civilians in a World at War, 1914-1918* (New York: New York University Press, 2010).
Richards, J. *Imperialism and Music. Britain 1876-1953* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001).
Robb, G. *British Culture and the Great War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).
Seal, G. *Inventing Anzac: The Digger and National Mythology* (Queensland: University of Queensland Press, 2004).
Searle, G.R. *A New England? Peace and War 1886-1918* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).
Smith, R. *Jamaican Volunteers in the First World War, Race Masculinity and the Development of National Consciousness* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).
Snape M. *God and the British Soldier: Religion and the British Army in the First and Second World Wars* (London: Routledge, 2005).
Sondhaus, L. *World War One: The Global Revolution (*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
Stibbe, M. *British Civilian internees in Germany: The Ruhleben Camp, 1914-1918* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008).
Thomson, A. *Anzac Memories: Living with the Legend* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
Travers, T. *The Killing Ground: the British Army, the Western Front and the Emergence of Modern War, 1900-1918* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2003).
Übergger, O and Bader-Zaa, B (ed) *Gender and the First World War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
van Emden, R. *Tommy's Ark* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2010).
Watkins, G. *Proof Through the Night: Music and the Great War* (London: University of California Press, 2002).
Winter, J. *Sites of Mourning, Sites of Memory. The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Journal Articles

Beaumont, J. '"Unitedly we have fought": Imperial loyalty and the imperial war effort', *International Affairs*, 90.2 (2014) pp. 397-412.
Bendle, M, 'The assault on Anzac: the legend and the left', *Quadrant* 53.7-8 (2009) pp. 7-14.
Brown, K. 'Modelling for war? Toy soldiers in Late Victorian and

Edwardian Britain' *Journal of Social History,* 24.2 (1990), pp. 237-54.
Bryant, S.J. "Fido on the Front" *Journal of Agricultural & Food Information,* 8.2 (2007) pp.103-9.
Connell, R.W. and Messerschmidt, J.W. "Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept", *Gender and society,* 19.6 (2005) pp. 829-859.
Fox, J. 'Conflict and consolation: British art and the First World War, 1914-1919', *Art History,* 36.4 (2013), pp. 810-833.
Gagen, W.J. 'Remastering the body, renegotiating gender: physical disability and masculinity during the First World War: the case of J.B. Middlebrook', *European Review of History*, 14.4 (2007) pp. 525- 541.
Gullance, N. F. 'White feathers and wounded men, patriotism and the memory of the Great War', *Journal of British Studies,* 36.2 (1997) pp.178-206.
Hoffenberg, P.H. 'Landscape, memory and the Australian war experience 1915-18', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 36.1 (2001) pp. 111-131.
Jones, E. 'The psychology of killing: The combat experience of British Soldiers during the First World War', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 41.2 (2006), pp. 229-46.
Kennedy, K. '"A music of grief": classical music and the First World War', *International Affairs,* 90.2 (2014), pp.379-395.
Kennedy, K and Tate, T. 'Literature and music of the First World War', *First World War Studies,* 2.1 (2011), pp.1-6.
Levine, P. 'Battle colors: race, sex, and colonial soldiery in World War I'. *Journal of Women's History* 9.4 (1998), pp. 104-30.
Mansell, J. 'Musical modernity and contested commemoration at the Festival of Remembrance, 1923-1927', *The Historical Journal,* 52.2 (2009), pp.433-454.
Marx, W. '"Requiem Sempiternum"? Death and the musical requiem in the twentieth century' *Mortality* 17.2 (2012), pp.119-129.
Rainbird, P. 'Representing nation, dividing community: The Broken Hill War Memorial, New South Wales, Australia, *World Archaeology*, 35.1 (2003), pp. 22-34.
Roper, M. 'Between the psyche and the social: masculinity, subjectivity and the First World War veteran', *Journal of Men's Studies* 15.3 (2007) pp. 251-270.
—. 'Between manliness and masculinity: the "War Generation" and the psychology of fear in Britain, 1914–1950', *Journal of British Studies*, 44.2 (2005) pp. 343-632.
Stibbe, M. 'The internment of civilians by belligerent States during the First World War and the response of the International Committee of

the Red Cross', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 41:1 (2006) pp. 5-19.

Bontrager, S. 'The imagined crusade: the Church of England and the mythology of nationalism and Christianity during the Great War', *Church History* 71.4 (2002), pp. 774-798.

Ward, P. '"Women of Britain Say Go": women's patriotism in the First World War', *Twentieth Century British History,* 12.1 (2001), pp. 23-45.

Woolacott, A. '"Khaki Fever" and its control: gender, class, age and sexual morality on the British Homefront in the First World War.', *Journal of contemporary History*, 29.2 (1994), pp. 325-47.